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ABSTRACT

Over the last few decades, the global consumption of luxury brands has rapidly increased. There are many internal and external factors that motivate consumers to buy a luxury brand. Although there is some evidence of the impact of functional, social, and individual values on luxury purchase intention, little has been done to compare cultures in terms of these values, especially in the Middle East. Thus, the purpose of this research was to compare Western and Middle Eastern culture (individualism and collectivism) regarding the consumers’ intention to purchase a luxury brand in terms of three main values (functional, social and individual), while also addressing consumer guilt.

The data for this study were collected from two countries—the United States and Saudi Arabia. A total of 478 university students participated in this study via an online survey: 171 from the United States and 277 from Saudi Arabia. The reliability of research scales was assessed through Cronbach’s alpha. Pearson’s correlation coefficient was applied to test the correlations between the study variables. Data was assessed using SEM. Before testing the proposed structural model, the measurement model was tested by a confirmatory factor analysis using the AMOS 21 program. Model fit was assessed via the chi-square statistic. The results revealed that Functional and Social values significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intention while Individual Value did not. Cultural Dimension did not moderate the relationship between Functional Value and Luxury Purchase Intention. Individualism moderated the relationship between Conspicuousness and Luxury Purchase Intention. The relationship between Conspicuousness and Luxury Purchase Intention was stronger within the high individualism group. Meanwhile, Guilt moderated the relationship between Uniqueness
and Luxury Purchase Intention. The relationship between Uniqueness and Purchase Intention was stronger within the high guilt group. However, Cultural Dimension and Consumer Guilt did not moderate the relationship between Individual Value and Luxury Purchase Intention. Attitude toward Luxury did not mediate the relationship between Functional and Social Value and Luxury Purchase Intention but it is partially mediated by the relationship between Individual Values and Luxury Purchase Intentions. These results add to the existing literature by addressing consumer guilt and Middle Eastern culture to luxury marketing, which can then be used for marketing purposes and to increase the sales of luxury brands. Theoretical and practical implications were provided based on the results.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, rare pieces of clothing and textiles have been produced solely for wealthy and powerful individuals. The production of these special pieces began thousands of years ago. Silk, for example, was deemed a luxury product during this era. In the twelfth century, silks were exported from the East to the Byzantine Empire to be used for both trade and as diplomatic gifts. In the late fourteenth century, luxury silk fabrics were woven in Italy and exported to France (Stuard, 2006). Haute couture did not appear in France until the eighteenth century when Queen Marie Antoinette introduced it to the French culture (Nudelman, 2009).

Between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries, during the era of the European Renaissance, the production and uses for luxury products started to change. Before the Renaissance, the wealthy and people of high social class were the only ones who could afford these products, and there were laws that restricted certain products to the high social class (Han, Nunes, & Drèze, 2010). In the West, the nobility controlled the use and the distribution of luxury products. Specifically, legislative codes specified the types of silks that were restricted for imperial manufacture and use (Harris, 2010). In the Renaissance, luxury products became available among the European upper middle class.

After the industrial revolution of the late eighteenth century, the consumption of luxury products changed. People started buying not from craftsmen but from factories that produced large quantities of products (Quickenden & Kover, 2007). Currently, luxury products are accessible to many groups of people, and they are frequently acquired
all over the world. A further discussion of the history of luxury products and brands will be presented in chapter 2.

Although many purchase luxury products and use the term “luxury” frequently, the term has many meanings, and must be clearly defined in order to assess the topic. Researchers have defined the term “luxury” in different ways. Some researchers have related the term to beauty, while others have associated it with high price (Grossman & Shapiro, 1988; Nueno & Quelch, 1998; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). In general, the term “luxury” is associated with beauty, high price, rarity, and exclusivity. In reference to rarity and exclusivity, Berry (1994) argued that the image of an “exclusive” luxury product is a deception used to increase consumption. He stressed that neither high price nor rarity are adequate conditions for a product to be a “luxury.” Furthermore, Berry (1994) stated that a luxury product falls into one or more of these categories: sustenance (food or drinks), shelter (home or hotel), clothing (apparel and accessories) and leisure (entertainment and sporting goods).

Regardless of the definition of luxury, the consumption of luxury products has increased worldwide over the past few years. The total worth of the luxury products market was $840 billion in 2004, and by 2010 it had jumped to $1 trillion (Yann, 2010). The growth widely increased from the period of 1995 to 2007. An 8% growth took place from 2004 to 2007, which was a period of expansion of the luxury industry into new markets and countries (Cesare & Gianluigi, 2011). In 2008, because of the worldwide economic slowdown, sales decreased by 2%. However, brands such as Louis Vuitton, Hermès, and Chanel experienced increased sales rates despite the crisis (Sherman, 2009).
The largest luxury brand markets are in Europe, Japan, and the United States. According to the Future of Luxury Goods Growth and Valuation Multiples (2009), global underlying luxury demand has grown at an annual rate of 7 to 8% over the last decade. In mature markets like Japan, luxury good brands have already penetrated almost all the population. In China, the consumption of luxury goods are expected to increase from 12% to 29% by 2015 (Bopeng & Jung-Hwan, 2013). Despite the growing levels of consumption in most countries, the underlying reasons behind consumption behavior may vary from one culture to another.

Although most research studies (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Hennigs, et al., 2012; Park, Ko, & Kim, 2010; Shukla, 2011; Shukla & Purani, 2012) have compared Western culture with Eastern culture regarding luxury brand consumption, most existing research does not compare Western with Middle Eastern culture. Therefore, the purpose of this dissertation is to compare Western and Middle Eastern culture in terms of consumers’ luxury purchase intentions. Previous research studies (Li & Su, 2007; Kazarian, 2011; Kwok et al., 1992; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Tynan, Teresa Pereira Heath, Ennew, Wang, & Sun, 2010; Zeffane, 2014) have shown that Western culture is based on individualism, while the Middle Eastern culture is based on collectivism. Thus, the guiding question of the research is as follows: Do individualist and collectivist consumers value luxury brands differently? Specifically, functional, social, and individual values will be the focus of this study.
1.1 Background

In this Study, luxury will be defined within the scope of the research. In addition, the cultures of individualism and collectivism will be differentiated. This section will discuss different aspects of values, including the functional (quality and uniqueness), social (social status and conspicuous consumption), and individual (self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem) aspects. In addition, consumer guilt, attitude and luxury purchase intentions will be discussed.

1.1.1 Luxury

Luxury brands are defined as those brands “whose ratio of functional utility to price is low while the ratio of intangible and situational utility to price is high” (Nueno & Quelch, 1998, p. 62). This definition compares functional and intangible utilities to price. Based on this definition, luxury brands have more intangible and situational value than functional value.

Grossman and Shapiro (1988) defined luxury products based on their social value. They defined luxury products as goods that are used or shown for social status or prestige without having a functional purpose. From their point of view, luxury products are mainly used for social purposes. However, luxury products can be used to show social status and for a functional purpose at the same time. For example, a woman may purchase a luxury brand jacket for two purposes: to prevent cold and to show high social status.

This study investigates luxury brands based on various aspects of their value. The definition that fits best with this study is that of Vigneron and Johnson (1999). They defined luxury brands as the highest level of prestigious products based on a number of
physical and psychological values. These values include functional, social, and individual values. This definition and how it fits the scope of this research will be discussed further in chapter two. This research divides the luxury concept into three main values, and each value further into sub-values. Functional values include quality and uniqueness. Social values include social status and conspicuousness. Individual values include self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem. Past literature has included additional luxury brand values, but this research will concentrate on the most prominent luxury values, as these values are most relevant to the topic of this study.

1.1.2 Individualism versus collectivism

There are two basic terms that can explain the relationship between people in a group. The first term is individualism; it emphasizes individual freedom, self-sufficiency, self-orientation, self-expression, self-dependence and control (Hofstede, 1980; Hui & Triandis, 1986). It refers to the culture where people derive pride from their own accomplishments (Hofstede, 1980). In an individualistic environment, people are less interested in contributing to social events unless their effort is recognized by others.

The second term is collectivism, and it involves the subordination of personal interests to the goals of the larger work group with an emphasis on community, society, or nation (Hofstede, 1980). These interests share, cooperate, and are concerned with group welfare. People in a collective culture feel responsible for the group and are oriented towards sharing group awards. They are socially contributory without concern that others will take advantage of them (Hofstede 1980; Hui & Triandis 1986; Morris, Davis, and Allene, 1994).
Some cultures seem to be more collectivist, while others are more individualistic. Previous studies (Li & Su, 2007; Kazarian, 2011; Kwok et al., 1992; Triandis et al., 1988; Tyan et al., 2010; Zeffane, 2014) have shown that Western cultures are more individualist, while Eastern and Middle Eastern cultures are more collectivist. Hofstede (1980) found that countries such as the United States, Australia, Canada, and Great Britain had high scores on the individualism dimension, while China, Pakistan, Thailand, Venezuela, and Mexico scored low.

Individualistic cultures have advantages and disadvantages. They are more likely to promote the development of an individual’s self-concept and self-confidence, and to foster personal responsibility for performance outcomes. In contrast, the opportunity to place emphasis on personal gain, selfishness, and expediency also exists (Morris et al., 1994). Individualistic cultures are associated with norms that support a person’s overall expressivity. That is, the expression of emotions and feelings is higher in individualistic cultures than in a collectivistic culture (Matsumoto et al., 2008).

Individualism and collectivism influence consumers’ choices of the products. Different values motivate consumers to consume luxury goods. According to Sheth, Newman & Gross (1991), there are five core values that influence consumer choices of products: functional, conditional, social, emotional and epistemic values. Hennigs et al. (2012) have explored four prominent dimensions of luxury value perception: financial, functional, individual and social (Figure 1).
In this research study, three main values will be explored: functional (quality and need for uniqueness), social (social status and conspicuousness), and individual values (self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem). This research will be based on four studies by Burnett and Lunsford (1994), Hennigs et al. (2012), Shukla and Purani (2012), and Truong and McColl (2011). The prominent values of the luxury brand perceptions explored by Hennigs et al. (2012) are financial, functional, individual, and social values. In Hennigs et al.’s (2012) results, the financial value had less impact on the consumers’ perception toward luxury. Specifically, their study findings show that consumers from the United States do not associate luxury brands with financial aspects. Thus, the financial value has been eliminated from this study. Hennigs et al. (2012) examined the usability, quality, and uniqueness values under the functional value. For the current study, the quality and uniqueness values will be examined because the usability value did not show
a significant result in Hennigs et al.’s past study. Hennigs et al. also examined social dimensions which includes consciousness and status. The result showed how those dimensions were at the moderate level for most countries. Thus, the same values of social dimension will be tested in this study. For the individual value, the self-identity value has been examined by Hennigs et al. They found varied affects among different cultures. Truong and McColl (2011) tested self-directed pleasure and self-esteem, and results showed that self-directed pleasure is a superior motivation for consumers in buying luxury products. In addition, self-esteem, which is an important concept in consumer behavior and rarely tested in luxury studies, strongly relates to both self-directed pleasure and the purchase of luxury products. Thus, the value of self-esteem will be tested in this study. Individualism and collectivism were tested in Shukla and Purani’s (2012) study, and the results showed the impact on luxury product consumption. The consumers in collectivist markets measured the value of a luxury brand different from consumers in individualistic markets. Lastly, the effect of consumer guilt will be addressed in this research based on Burnett and Lunsford’s (1994) research. They found that consumer guilt showed a direct impact on the consumer decision-making process.

1.1.3 Functional value

In general, a product or service is designed to provide a particular function (Wiedmann, Hennigs, & Siebels, 2009). The functional value of a product refers to the aspects that make it functional, such as price, quality, uniqueness, and usability. This functional value represents the perceived utility of a product characteristic; it refers to basic product benefits, such as quality, uniqueness, usability, reliability, and durability (Sheth, Newman, & Gross, 1991). Functional value also represents the ability of the
product to perform its functional, utilitarian, or physical purposes. In fact, consumers expect a luxury product to be functional, of good quality, and unique enough to satisfy their need for uniqueness (Wiedmann et al., 2009). In this research, quality and uniqueness values will be the main dimensions of functional value.

Quality value

Quality is one of the basic benefits and functional aspect that can be seen in a luxury product. Luxury brand consumers believe that luxury brands possess high quality. Luxury brand products should have a high quality that sets them apart from other non-luxury brands. Cesare and Gianluigi (2011) believed that quality is the main attribute relative to luxury goods, followed by craftsmanship, design, and aesthetic value. Particularly in developed markets, consumers purchase luxury products for their quality and functional values (Shukla, 2012). Gentry, Putrevu, Shultz, and Commuri (2001) found that the main reason why consumers buy luxury brands is due to their high quality. However, quality is still considered one of the main reasons for a consumer’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction regarding a product. To better understand the measurement of quality, quality also must be defined.

Quality is “the standard of something as measured against other things of a similar kind; the degree of excellence of something: an improvement in product quality” (Oxford, p. 634). The International Standards Organization defines quality as the overall characteristic of a whole that has the capacity to satisfy the direct and tacit needs of consumers (Brown & Rice, 1998). In other words, the quality refers to what extent a product has satisfied its consumers.
According to Brown and Rice (1998), the quality of a luxury apparel product has two dimensions: a physical dimension that includes the design, material, finish methods, etc., and a behavioral dimension that indicates what the item can achieve. Garvin (1983) measured quality for a product in general by counting the incidence internal errors that occur in the factory, and external errors that happen in the field. Moreover, the quality of the luxury product should meet the consumer’s high level of satisfaction since high quality is associated with a high price (Bian & Moutinho, 2009).

**Need for uniqueness**

Need for uniqueness is defined as “the trait of pursuing differences relative to others through the acquisition, utilization, and disposition of consumer goods for the purpose of developing and enhancing one’s self-image and social image” (Tian, Bearden, & Hunter, 2001, p. 52). Tian & McKenzie, (2001) defined consumers’ need for uniqueness as one’s desire to engage in consumer behaviors that avoid conformity by making creative, unpopular choices and choices that are not similar to the choices of others. More simply, Snyder and Fromkin (1980) defined the need for uniqueness as a desire to be different than others. Researchers who have investigated the need for uniqueness believe that those with a higher level of a need for uniqueness have some features that differentiate them from others who do not have this need. They usually look, think, and respond differently, and they are willing to take risks to achieve their need-for-uniqueness goals.

An abundance of evidence suggests that consumers have a desire to differentiate themselves from others in an act of “avoiding similarity” (Lee & Leizerovici, 2011). Being different from others or becoming distinctive in a large group is often a result of
the need for uniqueness. In their theory about people’s need for uniqueness, Snyder and Fromkin (1977) assumed that uniqueness motivations are motivated by people’s perceptions of how much they correspond to others. People react and dress differently to maintain an appropriate level of uniqueness from others. Conversely, “when people feel very similar to others, they will raise those behaviors and activities that express their distinction” (Ruvio, 2008, p. 446). Snyder and Fromkin (1977) concluded that the desire for uniqueness is restricted by the need for social approval.

The need for uniqueness motivates retailers to display different styles with their products, especially in the fashion and apparel markets. Such stores have reduced apparel with similar designs or similar products, which once prevailed in this market, and have revised different apparel styles to achieve uniqueness. The display of a variety of consumer goods may be the primary result of the desire for uniqueness: the desire to look different from other people. To avoid similarity, consumers actively seek out different and rare products to achieve a level of uniqueness.

1.1.4 Social value

This term refers to the perceived utility that a person acquires from consuming a product or service along with a group of people, such as prestige or conspicuousness that affects an individual’s decision to purchase a luxury product (Bearden & Etzel, 1982; Kim, 1998; Vigneron & Johnson, 1999). One’s social group also affects the person’s evaluation of the product itself. Social groups assign separate social meanings to different luxury products. For example, a lady carrying a Gucci handbag, which is worth $695, can project something different about her social standing than a lady carrying a Coach bag worth $268 (Han, Nunes, & Drèze, 2010). The price and the association
between a brand and its users give a luxury product its social meaning (Muniz & O’Guinn, 2001).

**Social status value**

In the past, particular products were reserved for high-class people; lower and middle classes did not have access to such high-priced items. According to Han et al. (2010), there were laws in some countries, especially in East Asia, that specified in detail what each group could wear, including the fabrics, colors, and types of adornment. Nowadays, people can wear what they like as long as they can afford it. In fact, people want to present their social status or to associate themselves with a higher social group by consciously consuming. In this research, two dimensions of social value will be discussed: social status and conspicuous consumption.

An individual’s selection of brand names is strongly related to his or her social status. The theory of social identity states that people seek either to associate or to disassociate themselves from certain categories of people. Clothing is the main way to achieve this end. People dress to associate and be part of the upper class or specific political groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

According to Han et al. (2010), some consumers are called “poseurs” (p. 17), which is the French word for a “person who pretends to be what he or she is not.” These people are highly motivated to purchase luxuries for the sole purpose of status. Some bottom-tier consumers want to buy luxury brands so they will appear to be wealthy people (Ordabeyeva & Chandon, 2011). Conversely, others have argued that luxury products have to be viewed from within their social and economic framework. The status of a luxury product depends on both the product’s features and the consumer’s social and
economic status. To some extent, conspicuous consumption has increased among bottom-tier consumers (Ordabeyeva & Chandon, 2011).

**Conspicuous value**

Conspicuous value is the other dimension of social value. Status consumption and conspicuous consumption are related and are also separated to some extent. They are related to the dimensions of the consumers’ motivational behavior towards products. However, each construct is unique and has distinctive characteristics that attract the consumers (O’Cass & McEwen, 2004).

In most contemporary research studies, the term “conspicuous consumption” is used to refer to luxury consumptions. Generally, the term is related to wealth, leisure class, and a display of social status. In 1899, Thorstein Veblen used the term “conspicuous consumption” to describe the acquisition and display of possessions with the intention of gaining social status. Veblen (1899) developed a concept of conspicuous consumption that later became the basis of leisure class and conspicuous consumption research. He established the leisure class as a standard and described conformity for all classes. The leisure class is the class of wealthy people or those who have inherited the highest social status, and they make an effort to keep and confirm their status (1899).

Even before Veblen, Smith (1759) believed that the need for social status as what led people to display their possessions and consume conspicuously (Majic & Majic, 2011). In contrast, using the recent case of Gucci vs. Guess, Majic and Majic (2011) have shown that consumers do not conform completely with Veblen’s theory of conspicuous consumption. These authors believe that the theory has to be readapted based on psychological and social factors that affect consumers’ decisions in purchasing luxury
products to confirm social status. Counterfeit products that are offered at lower prices are the best example. In fact, conspicuous consumption is not limited to just wealthy and high class people; recently, conspicuous consumption has increased among the lower and middle class.

Higher equality increases conspicuous consumption among bottom-tier consumers because it allows them to rise above more people and increases their satisfaction with their level of possessions. Both the possession gap and the position gain influence conspicuous spending decision (Ordabayeva & Chandon, 2011). Scott, Mende, and Bolton (2013) concluded that conspicuous consumption is an alternative or a surrogate for actual wealth. That is, it enhances both the wealth effect and impressions of competence. Increasing equality is the main reason that encourages bottom-tier consumers to buy luxury products and spend on conspicuous consumption to allow them to get ahead of other people. At the same time, increasing equality reduces spending on inconspicuous consumption because it raises the consumers’ level of satisfaction toward their current level of possessions (Ordabayeva & Chandon, 2011). For example, a woman might purchase a luxury handbag but have an old dishwasher from a little known brand at home simply because the dishwasher does not appear in public (Yajin & Griskevicius, 2014).

Conspicuous consumption not only encourages consumers to consume luxury products that appear to others but also promotes the brand’s prominence, which is defined as “the extent to which a product has visible markings that help ensure observers recognize the brand” (Han et al., 2010). Han et al. (2010) showed that people with a high
need for status and a desire to be associated with the upper class are more likely to consume luxury products with a visibly apparent and recognizable brand.

1.1.5 Individual value

The individual value addresses values related to self and personal issues. It focuses on a consumer’s personal orientation toward a luxury product. These internal motivations are self-reward, a person’s attitude, personality, self-pleasure, self-esteem, self-identity, originality, and perfection. In this dissertation, self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem will be discussed.

Self-identity

Self-identity is one of the psychological variables that relates to luxury brand consumption, and it can be defined as the “relatively enduring characteristics that people ascribe to themselves” (Sparks & Guthrie, 1998, p. 1396). The term “self-identity” includes the total of self, identity, and scheme that compose one’s sense of self (Markus, 1977). Self-identity includes one’s preferences or attitudes; it is the labels people use to describe themselves” (Biddle, Bank, & Slavings, 1987, p. 326). According to Smith, Terry, Manstead, Louis, Kotterman, and Wolfs (2008), self-identity is the salient part of one’s self. Overall, self-identity reflects people’s beliefs about who they are. Thoits and Virshup (1997) reported that self-identity has three main components: 1) self-identity, which reflects one’s characteristics, 2) role identity, which refers to a person who performs a particular social role, and 3) social identity, which identifies a person within a group of people. An individual’s decision to purchase a luxury brand is affected by his or her self-identity.
Self-identity is strongly related to human behavior. Researchers agree that self-identity is a result of social interaction and influences individual behavior (Wylie, 1979; Rosenberg, 1979). In a psychological and sociological framework, self-identity is an important part of the self’s behavior. Self-identity and prior behavior both affect a person’s behavior intention. In fact, repeated behavior becomes a part of one’s self-identity (Chang et al., 1988). Therefore, based on Chang et al.’s findings (1988), the repeated behavior of luxury purchases could become part of an individual’s identity. In contrast, self-identity influences one’s decision to either purchase or not to purchase luxury brands.

Self-identity is related to self-attitude. Attitude is a “lasting general evaluation of people (including oneself), objects, advertisements, or issues” (Solomon, 2011, p. 256). Self-identity is an antecedent of attitude. Both ethical commitments and self-identity measurements play a role in the prediction of attitude and behavioral intention (Shaw & Shiu, 2002). Attitude and behavior are strongly related. For instance, the theory of planned behavior indicates that human behavior is not spontaneous but that action is a result of one’s attitudes, norms, and perception (Ajzen, 1991).

Self-directed pleasure

Self-directed pleasure is defined as an intense and essential element that people perceive to create their own hedonic experiences (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Simply, self-directed pleasure is “the feelings of bliss, contentment, and ecstasy for the self” (Tsai, 2005, p. 433). There are two kinds of directed-pleasure: self-directed pleasure that represents self-bliss, happiness, and ecstasy; and social-directed pleasure, which is related
to caring for and loving others. Self- and social-directed pleasures are both values that consumers satisfy by acquiring luxuries.

Luxury brands promote happiness for some consumers. These individuals consume luxury products not for the status or prestige that may be associated with them; instead, they seek self-pleasure. Most luxury consumers who spend their disposable income on luxuries are motivated mainly by self-directed pleasure (Silverstein & Fiske, 2005); they seek not just to acquire pleasure but also to escape pain. The pleasant feelings experienced when acquiring an item from a luxury brand vary from person to person.

**Self-esteem**

Self-esteem is an overall evaluation of one’s self-concept (Leonard, Beauvais, & Sholl, 1995). It refers to the extent to which people like, value, accept, and respect themselves on a global level (Rosenberg, 1979). Self-esteem is also defined as a mixture of feelings of self-amusement, self-worth, self-respect, and self-acceptance (Brown, 1993). It is the degree of positivity of a person’s self-concept (Solomon, 2011). Since self-esteem is an overall evaluation of one’s self-concept, this evaluation could be positive or negative.

A positive evaluation refers to high self-esteem, whereas a negative evaluation indicates low self-esteem. In general, high self-esteem is associated with positive outcomes, such as life satisfaction, happiness, adjustment, and academic success, whereas low self-esteem is associated with stress, anxiety, depression, behavioral problems, deviation, and academic failure (Harter, 1987; Huebner, 1991; Masten & Garmezy, 1985). People with low self-esteem are not expected to perform well. In addition, both
consumers with high and low self-esteem are predicted to consume luxuries. High self-esteem consumers are likely to purchase luxury brands because they think that they deserve them. In contrast, consumers with low self-esteem typically purchase luxury brands in order to enhance their self-esteem or to avoid rejection (Mandel and Smeesters, 2008). Mandel and Smeesters (2008) assumed that individuals with low self-esteem would show higher consumption levels than other consumers with high self-esteem. In addition, compulsive buyers showed lower self-esteem than other consumers; they seemed to try to enhance their self-esteem by spending money (Faber & O’Guinn, 1992).

1.1.6 Consumer guilt

Guilt refers to an individual’s “unpleasant emotional state associated with possible objection to his or her actions, inactions, circumstances, or intentions” (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994, p. 245). Guilt can be defined as an emotional situation involving penitence, remorse, self-blame, and self-punishment (Huhmann & Brotherton, 1997). Guilt also is defined as an emotional feeling associated with remorse, regret, and empathic concern (Dahl et al., 2003). Consumer guilt is a type of guilt that relates specifically with decision situations regarding consumption. In general, guilt is a negative evaluation and its associated emotions that occur after a specific behavior (Özhan & Kazançoğlu, 2010). It is related to impulsive, compulsive, and hedonic consumption (Puri 1996; O’Guinn & Faber, 1989; Okada, 2005).

Consumer feelings of guilt are categorized into three types according to the period of time in which they occur: anticipatory, reactive, and proceeding guilt. Anticipatory guilt is experienced when one contemplates a purchase; it influences the decision before it is even made. Reactive guilt occurs after the transaction has been made. Finally,
proceeding guilt occurs at the time of purchase (Lin & Xia, 2009; Özhan & Kazançoğlu, 2010).

Consumer guilt is related to luxury brand consumption due to the high price of these items. An individual who spends too much money on a piece of luxury may start to blame himself or herself. People feel guilty after they obtain luxury products because they have just spent a lot of money on non-practical items (Kivetz & Simonson, 2002).

1.1.7 Attitude and Luxury purchase intention

**Attitude**

Attitude is a complex term that includes one’s beliefs, feelings, perceptions, and actions. It can be used to determine one’s behavior because attitude directly affects intention, which is directly influenced by behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Attitude is a lasting general evaluation of people, objects, and issues (Solomon, 2011). It is also defined as a salient belief toward a certain behavior and the evaluation of those beliefs. This evaluation continues over time (Shim, Morris, & Morgan, 1989). Consumers’ positive attitudes toward luxury brands are affected by their social and psychological experiences with luxuries, which can lead to positive purchase intentions and behaviors.

Attitudes can be formed in different ways. Based on literature, attitudes may be formed towards a product due to either classical conditioning or instrumental conditioning. Classical conditioning involves placing a neutral signal before a reaction is taken. It focuses on automatic behaviors. Instrumental conditioning involves applying reconciliation or punishment after a behavior. Given the complexity of attitude, researchers may apply multiattribute attitude model to understand the concept. This
model assumes that a consumer's attitude toward an object depends on the person's beliefs about its attributes (Solomon, 2011).

Attitude toward luxury products is strongly affected by culture and social norms. Yim et al. (2014) have developed a model that employs the exposure to normative interpersonal influence and brand consciousness to investigate the relationship between cultural influences and consumer attitudes toward luxury products. The results showed that the external parts of the model which include the cultural dimension constructs (horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism, and vertical collectivism) are prior to normative interpersonal influence. It is also an antecedent to the internal part of the model in which normative interpersonal influence the formation of consumer attitudes toward luxury brands.

**Luxury purchase intention**

Purchase intention is the willingness to buy a product. It is the connection point between an attitude and a purchase behavior (Sangyoung & Sungyoung, 1999). Purchase intention is more effective in predicting purchase behavior than attitude because consumers experience a more direct effect from purchase intention than from attitude (Koh, 2013). Purchase intention is the last step in the model of attitude toward purchasing, which measures a person’s attitude toward the act of buying instead of the attitude toward the product itself (Solomon, 2011). To determine a consumers’ intention toward luxury brands, their attitude toward the concept of luxury must also be considered.

Cesare and Gianluigi (2011) have investigated the determinants of purchase intention for fashion luxury goods in the Italian market. They concluded that consumers
purchase luxury fashion products basically to match their lifestyle, thus pleasing their internal motivations (Cesare and Gianluigi, 2011). The pyramid map resulting from their data demonstrates that self-confidence and self-fulfillment are the basic latent final values when purchasing luxury products. Their research, however, examined the luxury consumption in the Italian market, which represents one of the largest and most mature markets for fashion luxury products. Hence, the result could be different if their study was conducted in another country.

1.2 Summary

In this chapter, the definition of luxury was provided. In addition, the two main dimensions of culture (individualism and collectivism) were described. The four values of a luxury brand were explained. Lastly, social guilt, attitude and luxury purchase intention were discussed.
CHAPTER 2: THE LITERATURE THAT INFORMS THE RESEARCH

As stated in the previous chapter, the main research question of this dissertation is: Do individualist and collectivist consumers value luxury brands differently? Based on this research question, this chapter will discuss research studies related to six core concepts: 1.) Luxury 2.) Individualism versus collectivism 3.) Functional value (quality and uniqueness 4.) Social value (social status and conspicuousness), 5.) Individual value (self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem) and 6.) Consumer guilt. In addition, attitude and luxury purchase intention will be addressed.

This chapter begins with an overview of luxury topics. I summarize the literature related to luxury in general and discuss the scope of the specific luxury definition that will be applied in this study. In relation to this, the literature relevant to individualism and collectivism is explored. Then, each luxury value is reviewed in depth, including functional, social, and individual value. Lastly, Consumers’ guilt literature is discussed and attitude toward luxury products and luxury purchase intention are presented. By reviewing these core concepts, this chapter highlights gaps between the existing literature and specific areas that need to be investigated.

2.1 Luxury

Historically, luxury brand stores were founded more than 100 years ago and were originally owned and managed by families. Thomas Burberry established Burberry in 1856 as a family store that he owned and managed (Collins, 2009). Another family-owned and managed store is Gucci, which was founded in Florence in 1921 (http://www.gucci.com). In the 1980s, three luxury designers, Bernard Arnault, Francois Pinault, and Johann Rupert, acquired many family-owned stores in France. Thus, three
luxury brand names were established: LVMH, Kering, and Richemont. By establishing those luxury brands, multinational corporations within the luxury market became prevalent (Som & Blanckaert, 2015). In the late twentieth century, luxury products became easily accessible for consumers across the world (Som & Blanckaert, 2015). Although luxury brands are consumed widely across different cultures, the term luxury may be defined differently.

Over the last two decades, researchers have studied luxury brands from different perspectives. As discussed in the introduction, the term “luxury” has many definitions. Each definition highlights a specific aspect of luxury. Some definitions emphasize beauty, whereas others emphasize expansiveness (Berry, 1994). This research applies the definition of Vigneron and Johnson (1999), in which a luxury brand is the highest level of prestigious products that also includes a number of physical and psychological values.

Since this definition addresses the gap between the two previous definitions: Grossman and Shapiro (1988) and Nueno and Quelch (1998) definitions, it will be applied in this study. Nueno and Quelch (1998) based their definition on the intangible and situational values of luxury brands. On the other hand, Grossman and Shapiro (1988) based their definition of luxury on social values. Indeed, Vigneron and Johnsons (1999) definition includes more luxury values, which make it suitable for this study, as this research will assess luxury values in a more holistic view. This definition is also applied in this study because it includes the social value scope of luxury, which is relevant to the social orientation of the college students being sampled in this research (Weidman, 1989).
Based on this definition, a luxury brand is at the highest level of prestigious products. That means that the luxury brands examined in this study are ranked at the highest level of status compared with other products. According to "Luxury Group International" (2012), the top luxury clothing brands are Gucci, Louis Vuitton, Burberry, Chanel, Versace, Prada, Dior, Alexander McQueen, Giorgio Armani, Ralph Lauren, Hermes, Dolce & Gabbana, Salvatore Ferragamo, Dunhill, and Calvin Klein. Based on this ranking and the first part of the definition, these brands along with others, were listed for participants to assess in the study.

This definition was applied successfully in several research studies in the past (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Hennigs et al., 2012; Park, Rabolt, & Jeon, 2008). Park et al. (2008) examined different physical and psychological dimensions based on this definition. The authors assessed purchasing frequency, conformity, consumer ethnocentrism, social recognition, and pocket money. Hennigs et al. (2012) based their study on this definition to investigate cross cultural luxury consumption. The luxury values that were investigated were financial, functional, individual, and social values. For instance, Gucci as a luxury brand has numerous physical and psychological values. It has a good history, high quality, country of origin, a charismatic founder, and celebrity associations (DeFanti, Bird, & Caldwell, 2014). The physical and psychological values that will be highlighted in this dissertation research are functional, social, and individual values.

When we buy a product, either we buy it because we like it or because others will like it. External and internal reasons motivate consumers to purchase luxury products (Vigneron & Johnson, 2004), External motivations are related to economic status and social aspects. Factors related to economic motivation include increasing disposable
income, reducing unemployment rates, decreasing production costs, the world-wide increase of female employment, and growing numbers of wealthy families in different countries (Yann, 2010). The consumers want to be socially exclusive and be a part of the richest social class or at least emulate that class. In addition, they may want to attract people and show their wealth (Han et al., 2010). According to Vigneron and Johnson (2004), internal motivations related to luxury consumption, like self-reward, are based on emotions and subjective feelings. Internal motivations are also related to the person's attitude, personality, pleasure, self-esteem, originality, and perfectionism.

All the previously mentioned motivations for purchasing luxury products may differ between males and females. Gender tends to look at fashion from different perspectives. Nicola and Karin (2013) have studied the role of gender in luxury brand consumption, because female luxury brands have higher prices than those of male luxury brands. They found that luxury products made specifically for women provide more uniqueness and status than non-luxury products. They observed differences in product designs based on the desires of males and females. Females have the desire of uniqueness while males have desire of attracting the other gender. In addition, consumer purchase intentions are expected to differ across cultures (Nicola & Karin, 2013).

Although several studies about luxury consumption have been conducted, few studies have discussed the concept in the framework of the culture feature: individualism and collectivism (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Hennigs, et al., 2012; Park, Ko, & Kim, 2010; Shukla, 2011; Shukla & Purani, 2012). Indeed, there is need to understand luxury in the context of culture, as there may be distinct differences across cultures. The next section discusses the literature relevant to the concepts of individualism and collectivism.
2.2 Individualism and Collectivism

To understand the differentiation between collectivism and individualism and their relation to luxury consumption, previous studies have to be explored. Previous studies (Li & Su, 2007; Kazarian, 2011; Kwok et al., 1992; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Tynan, Teresa Pereira Heath, Ennew, Wang, & Sun, 2010; Zeffane, 2014) showed that some cultures are collectivism while others are individualism. Even within one culture, people can be collectivist or individualistic. Hui and Villareal (1989) found that collectivism and individualism are clearly distinguished even within one culture. In their comparison study between the United States and Hong Kong, they concluded that collectivist people have a high need for affiliation, nurturance, and succorance. At the same time, they have a low need for autonomy, which is in complete contrast with individualistic people.

There is also a difference between urban and rural people both within one culture and across different cultures. In their correlation of American and Kenyan society, Ma & Schoeneman (1997) pointed out that people from customary, collectivist Kenyan societies would have plans toward oneself with more social parts than would those from individualized American society. The thoughts toward oneself of urbanized and educated Kenyans would be less social than those of conventional Kenyans. The results suggested that Kenyan attitudes are more aggregate and less individualized than Western or American thoughts toward oneself. Moreover, elements of urbanization, improvement, modernization, and instruction may impact the plans toward oneself of Kenyans living in Nairobi and bring about a diminished level of collectivism (Ma & Schoeneman, 1997).
Lee and Ro (1992) showed how consumers from collectivist and individualist cultures value products differently. They compared Korean consumers, which represent collectivism, and American consumers, which represent individualism cultures. This study showed that collectivist culture consumers consider the importance of family in their evaluation of the products. In addition, they tend to be more family-oriented than individualistic consumers (Lee and Ro, 1992). Based on this study, their decision to either buy or not to buy luxury product mostly depends on others’ points of view, including their family, friends, or society. If others value luxury products, then they are more likely to purchase them. In individualistic cultures, consumers are more likely to purchase luxury products depending on their personal points of view. They are more likely to purchase luxury products to satisfy psychological aspects. Thus, collectivist cultures seek different values from luxury product consumption compared to individualist cultures (Lee and Ro, 1992).

Morris et al. (1994) concluded that individualism-collectivism is a salient cultural dimension across societies. They provided evidence from three countries U.S, South Africa and Portugal. The measurement methods used by Morris et al. were adapted from Hofstede's (1980) societal individualism-collectivism scale and Earley's (1989) collectivism and social loafing scale. The organizational level of individualism-collectivism was observed by comparison to Hofstede's (1980) results at a societal level. Hofstede (1980) found the United States to be the most individualistic culture, followed by South Africa and Portugal. The results of the Morris et al. (1994) study showed the importance of the collective impact on the attitudes and behaviors of an organization’s
employees. The results also indicated the role of individualism-collectivism in understanding entrepreneurial behavior.

Recently, Muk et al. (2014) explored cultural differences between individualist and collectivist cultures in terms of their intentions to like a brand page. Young American participants represent individualism, while Korean participants represent collectivist consumers. Researchers applied the theory of planned behavior to study the relationships between consumers’ attitudes, perceived behavioral control, social influence, intentions to join, and intentions to purchase. The findings showed that collectivism and individualism impact consumers' intention (Muk et al., 2014). In a collectivist society, there is a strong influence of attitudes, social influence, and perceived behavioral control on brand fans than in individualist one.

Although the studies reviewed examined many cultures, none assess Saudi cultures versus American cultures. This is especially important as Saudi cultures have a propensity toward luxury products (Larenaudie, 2008). Although Muk et al. (2014) addressed the gap between culture and purchase intention, it does not examine brand values. Thus, there is a need to study brand value perceptions based on the cultural differences of individualism versus collectivism. The following section will discuss luxury brand values and cultural differences.

2.3 Luxury values

2.3.1 Functional value

Some consumers purchase luxury brands mainly for their functional value. Functional values include usability, quality and uniqueness values (Hennigs et al. 2012). The high quality of the products is one of the main functional values. Indeed, it is hard to
imagine a luxury product with little or no quality. Although usability is a functional value, it is not as notable as quality and uniqueness. For example, consumers may purchase some luxury items without considering their usability. In this section, quality and uniqueness will be discussed as functional

Quality value

Quality is one of the main dimensions that characterizes luxury products and attracts people to purchase them. It is usually related to the high price. Thus, there is a positive relationship between quality and cost. The relation between price and quality is readily apparent in luxury products (Stamper, Sharp & Donnell, 1986). According to Brucks, Zeithaml, and Naylor (2000), it was observed that consumers use the price of a product to determine the product’s quality. Beverland (2005) emphasized that price and quality goes hand in hand. Thus, luxury brands are characterized by a high price and excellent quality. Lalwani and Shavitt (2013) concluded that there was a strong relationship between price and quality, and consumers have a great tendency to use price information to judge the quality of a product.

Huang and Tan (2007) conducted a study to determine the factors that affect apparel design and quality in Taiwan. They found that fashion sensitivity, material application ability, color sensitivity, fashion trend, fashion market positioning, and management are factors that impact the quality of apparel design. Likewise, fashion style, cloth quality, cutting quality, discount, and personal favorites are key factors that affect a consumer’s choice of apparel goods. Market analysis and market development are very important to ensuring that a product will be ranked highly by consumers. From this study, we can observe how important quality is in the apparel sector.
Perry and Kyriakaki (2014) have examined the decision-making process used by luxury fashion consumers in Greece, applying Sheth’s (1981) model. They found that quality is the most important criteria in selecting suppliers and evaluating merchandise. Other important factors are design, style, fashionability, brand reputation, and appropriateness. This study provided insights into the decision-making process of luxury fashion consumers and illustrated the importance of quality as an essential factor for making purchase decisions for fashion luxury products.

Need for uniqueness

The other dimension of functional value is uniqueness. Consumers purchase luxury products mainly because they are looking for uniqueness. Researchers have studied the relationship between luxury brands and the need for uniqueness (Miremadi, Fotoohi, Sadeh, Tabrizi, & Javidigholipourmashhad, 2011). Due to their high price and rarity, consumers conclude that luxury products will satisfy their needs for uniqueness and differentiate them from others. Previous research studies also have shown that people with a high need for uniqueness favor rare, innovative, and non-traditional items (Lynn & Snyder, 2002; Workman & Caldwell, 2007).

The need for uniqueness is restricted by social norms. Consumers want to be different, but at the same time, they need to be socially accepted. Ruvio (2008) studied the role of consumers’ need for uniqueness, concentrating on the role of need for uniqueness for fashion consumers. The result provided a new theoretical view of the interaction between consumers’ needs for uniqueness and social distinction, supporting the concept that consumers want to express their uniqueness in a safe way without damaging their social norms.
Consumers differ in their desires for uniqueness. The desire to engage in consumer behaviors that avoid conformity is not same for all consumers. Fashion opinion leaders are expected to purchase luxury brands to satisfy their desire for uniqueness. Workman and Kidd (2000) have studied the need for uniqueness among fashion groups. They developed a need for uniqueness scale to determine the characteristics of fashion consumer groups. The purpose of their study was to identify differences between fashion opinion leaders, fashion innovators, innovative communicators, and fashion followers in their needs for uniqueness. The result showed that there was a significant difference between fashion groups. The greater uniqueness desire was exhibited in fashion change agents (Workman and Kidd, 2000). Although this study showed various levels of need for uniqueness among different consumers, it did not illustrate their desire to purchase high-priced and luxury goods. Further study of consumers' needs for uniqueness can provide a better understanding of consumer behavior, as it relates to their motivation towards luxury goods.

The relationship between need for uniqueness and luxury brand intention have been studied specifically. Miremadi et al. (2011) showed the impact of need for uniqueness on purchasing luxury brands intention in Iran and the United Arab Emirates. They considered creativity, unpopular choice, and avoidance of similarity as three dimensions of uniqueness. They found that consumers wanted to express their uniqueness without losing social assimilations. They also showed interrelationships among the main three dimensions of need for uniqueness. Although this study compares two different cultures in terms of their need for uniqueness, both cultures represent collectivist societies.
Moreover, there is need to address the gap and compare need for uniqueness between individualistic and collectivist cultures.

Since the expression of uniqueness should occur within social norms, social value has to be determined. Although these studies discussed the relationship between functional value and luxury brands consumption, there is still a need to discuss the relationship between social value and luxury brand consumption. The next section will review the literature of social value.

2.3.2 Social value

Social status value

Several studies have investigated the relation between social status and luxury brands. Such studies explore the effect of social status on individuals' preferences of luxury brands (Han et al., 2010). Some research studies, however, focus on how people look for new social status and prestige from luxury brands (Han et al., 2010; Nelissen & Meijers, 2011; Hennigs et al., 2012).

Loureiro and Araújo (2014) have conducted a study in Brazil to examine consumer’s individual and social luxury values. Specifically, how social luxury values impact the consumers' attitude and behavior. They also investigated consumer’s intention to pay more for luxury clothing. The results showed that social values have a positive impact on subjective norms and have a negative influence on behavioral control. Thus, consumers who look for social status may be motivated to buy luxury products. They also strongly recommend others to purchase luxury goods.

Recently, Hennigs et al. (2012) divided consumers into four clusters in terms of their luxury values: the luxury lovers, the status-seeking hedonists, the satisfied
unpretentious, and the rational functionalists (figure 2). This cross-culture study investigated the different values of luxury among consumers from ten countries. The luxury lovers and the status-seeking hedonists showed high rates for social values. Indian, Japanese, American, and French consumers placed the most importance on social value, while Spanish consumers placed less importance on social value. Accordingly, luxury consumption is either conspicuous or inconspicuous.

Figure 2. Cluster comparison

Conspicuous value

Although status consumption and conspicuous consumption seem to have the same meaning, O’Cass and McEwen (2004) found that status consumption and conspicuous consumption are related but separate. They are both related to dimensions of consumers’ motivational behavior toward products; however, each construct is unique and has
distinctive characteristics that attract consumers. Beside the differentiation in conspicuous consumption among different social class levels, there is variation across cultures.

Indeed, there is a relation between conspicuous consumption and individualism. However, there is also evidence of conspicuous consumption in collectivism cultures. According to The Future of Luxury Goods: Growth and Valuation Multiples (2009), in mature markets like Japan, luxury goods brands have already penetrated virtually 100% of the population. In China, consumption of luxury goods is projected to rise from 12% in 2007 to 29% by 2015 (Bopeng & Jung-Hwan, 2013). In fact, both Japan and China are considered to be collectivist cultures; however, other studies had contrasting results. Souiden et al. (2011) revealed that conspicuous consumption was higher in individualistic cultures (Canada) than in collectivist cultures (Tunisia).

Each individual consumes conspicuously for different reasons. Kastanakis and Balabanis (2014) believe that luxury brands are never consumed in the same way at the macro level. Even macro-level outcomes such as snobbery or bandwagon consumption depend on micro-level individual consumer characteristics. However, some people believe that the consumption of luxury products is a conspicuous waste, as it does not serve humans’ well-being. Further, they feel it is wasteful mainly because of the high prices.

Social value may not be the same importance level for consumers. Such consumers purchase luxury brands to satisfy all values together, while some will purchase luxury brands to satisfy their personal needs (Hennigs et al. 2012). Personal or individual values involve a different set of motivations, thus, it is important that individual values towards
luxury brands also be assessed. The next section will review individual values related to luxury brand consumption self-identity, self-directed pleasure and self-esteem.

2.3.3 Individual value

Self-identity

Self-identity is the total of characteristics that people attribute to themselves (Sparks & Guthrie, 1998). Researchers have examined self-identity as a precedent to attitude. A consumer’s attitude is the antecedent of purchasing intention. Shaw and Shiu (2002) found that both ethical obligation and self-identity were closely related to the prediction of attitude and behavioral intention. They applied structural equation modeling instead of regression analysis to clarify the precise roles of ethical obligation and self-identity. They concluded that the role of ethical obligation and self-identity is better represented through the prediction of behavioral intention instead of attitude.

There is some concern about self-identity measurements. According to Sparks and Guthrie (1998), measures of identity are measures of the past. A mixture of values, attitudes, and repeated behaviors affect self-identity. It is difficult to measure self-identity because it is a complicated dimension that cannot be separated from other dimensions, like self-attitude and values.

Purchase intention and other consumer behaviors can be predicted based on self-identity. Consumers behave based on a variety of psychological values. Smith et al. (2008) applied descriptive and injunctive/prescriptive norms, self-identity, and past behavior to improve the predictive power of planned behavior theory. The findings revealed that attitudes, norms, past behavior, and self-identity were positively related to
purchase intention. Therefore, purchase intention can be predicted based on self-identity. That is, consumers seem to behave in ways that are confirmed by their self-identity.

The effect of self-identity is not the same in all societies, however. The impact of self-identity on purchase intention varies from a cross-cultural perspective. Hennigs et al. (2012) showed that US consumers emphasized individual values the most, followed by consumers from India and Brazil. Spanish consumers did not emphasize the importance of individual values on their purchasing intention. Some consumers who are rooted in their self-identity consider luxury a main part of their lives. Those consumers are high in their desire for status and hedonics. Indeed, those consumers weigh their individual values more heavily than social values.

**Self-directed pleasure**

Most researchers refer to this motivation of directed pleasure as hedonic motivation (Dubois & Laurent, 1996; Vigneron & Johnson, 2004). Hedonic motivation involves an emotional response, thus, consumers purchase a product to satisfy their emotional needs. The desire for pleasure is the consumer’s goal in this case (Solomon, 2011). People shop to escape from their daily life’s routine and also to meet their pleasure needs. In fact, both personal and social pleasures are the result of hedonic motivation.

Shu-pei (2005) established a model that specifies the antecedents and consequents of personal orientation towards luxury brand consumption. He found that luxury brand purchase value is impacted by personal orientation. He stated that independent self-construal predicted self-directed goals of luxury brand purchase and self-directed pleasure. The author stressed that there is a need for self-directed pleasure when
maintaining brand loyalty. This study confirmed that purchasing luxury brands depend on both social and individual values.

Yann (2010) tested a model of the impact of extrinsic and intrinsic personal aspirations on consumer decision making in the luxury brands market. He found that intrinsic aspirations are more strongly related to conspicuous consumption. Therefore, consumers who value intrinsic aspirations buy luxury products for quality and self-directed pleasure, not for conspicuous consumption. They focus more on their own pleasure of purchasing luxury brands than on the display of possessions.

Comparing individualistic and collectivist cultures (Britain and India) in terms of self-directed pleasure, Shukla and Purani (2012) found that individualistic consumers attach less psychological meaning to luxury consumption. Both cultures showed non-significant hedonism and pleasure seeking. Consumers seem to prefer products that represent quality, aesthetics, and authenticity rather than satisfying self-aspects. This preference may be due to the economic recession that forced consumers to consider rational values over pleasure-seeking. Although this study compared collectivist and individualistic cultures in terms of directed symbolic, hedonic, utilitarian, and cost values, some important values need to be investigated.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem affects consumption in various ways. Mandel and Smeesters (2008) examined the role of self-esteem on mortality salience consumptions, finding that mortality salience consumption increased particularly for consumers with low self-esteem. Self-esteem also impacts consumers’ choices of products. They consume to escape from self-awareness. In this study, the relationship between self-esteem and
consumption was demonstrated. When individuals have low self-esteem, they are more likely to increase their consumption activities. It is important to note, however, that this study focused on food not apparel products.

Self-directed pleasure strongly impacts self-esteem. According to Truong and McColl (2011), the relationship between self-esteem and self-directed pleasure is eminent. They illustrate how purchasing luxury products as a self-reward may satisfy individuals' needs for self-esteem. Although this study expanded the understanding of the relationship between self-esteem and luxury consumption, there are few reports of the impacts of self-esteem on luxury purchase intention. The authors stated that future researchers should include self-esteem as an antecedent of luxury purchase intention, a step which this dissertation research will address.

Another aspect assumed to be an antecedent or consequent of luxury brand consumption is consumers' guilt. Consumers' guilt is thought to be related to consumption in general. It is expected to be strongly related to luxury brand consumption specifically. Consumer guilt may impact individual values specifically. The next section will discuss and review consumers’ guilt.

2.4 Consumer guilt

Consumer guilt was first explored by Burnett and Lunsford (1994). They attempted to define and explain consumer guilt. They found that consumer guilt may explain consumers’ purchase intentions, and guilt also gives retailers an opportunity to persuade their customers to buy their products. Consumer guilt has been used as simulation appeal in the markets for undesirable behaviors such as alcohol and tobacco consumption. The
authors concluded that a guilty feeling is all about the degree of control over the outcome. If the degree of the control over the situation is high, the guilty feelings will be high. Conversely, if the degree is low, no guilty feelings will be expected.

Hibbert et al. (2007) examined the level of guilt that consumers experience when they are exposed to donation advertising or donation intentions. They also examined the relationship between knowledge of persuasion tactics and charities by applying the persuasion knowledge model. They found that guilty feelings are positively related to donation intention. Guilty feelings are, in fact, impacted by persuasion knowledge. By illustrating the role of persuasion, the findings supported the idea that consumers are active in marketing communications and agent knowledge. The manipulative intent is negatively related to guilty feelings, and beliefs about a charity are positively related to guilt arousal.

Chattopadhyay (2010) found that in India, one-third of consumers experienced guilt about purchasing a global luxury brand. This feeling of guilt motivated these consumers to adjust their choices of luxuries. Therefore, our feelings can and do affect our choices of products.

Özhan & Kazançoğlu (2010) attempted to develop a phenomenological account of consumer guilt, and they revealed five dimensions of consumer guilt: hesitation, sadness, reluctance to spend, regret, and self-blame. Consumer guilt is usually a result of transgressions, self-control failures, and indulgence in hedonistic desires. Guilty feelings, in fact, have short lives and are superficial. It is usually a result of bad or good, not right or wrong, actions. Indeed, consumers’ guilt depends on individualistic values, such as striving for individual distinctiveness and independence in lifestyle choices. Guilty
feelings in general are a result of personal and socio-cultural norms Özhan & Kazançoğlu, 2010).

Luxury values, individualism and collectivism and consumer guilt are factors that lead to either positive or negative attitude concerning luxury purchase intention. To better understand consumer’s attitude and intention, these topics have to be reviewed in depth. The next section reviews the concept of attitude and luxury purchase intention.

2.5 Attitude and Luxury purchase intention

The growth of luxury product consumption has encouraged researchers to study various dimensions like attitude and luxury purchase intention. Zhang & Kim (2013) examine the factors that impact Chinese consumers’ attitude towards purchasing luxury fashion products. They examined five core factors: brand consciousness, materialism, social comparison, fashion innovativeness, and fashion involvement. Moreover, they examined the impact of consumer attitude on luxury purchase intention. Generally, the result of this study showed that Chinese consumers have positive attitude towards purchasing luxury products. In particular, the three factors: brand consciousness, social comparison and fashion innovativeness have a significant effect on attitude towards purchasing luxury fashion goods. In addition, Chinese consumers’ luxury purchasing intention was impacted by their attitude towards buying luxury goods.

Luxury purchase intention measures a person’s attitude toward the act of buying instead of the attitude toward the product itself (Solomon, 2011). Purchase intention shows to what extent a person is willing to purchase a product. For instance, Park et al. (2008) studied global luxury brand purchasing among young Korean consumers. Their study attempted to identify why young Korean consumers purchased global luxury
fashion. Different reasons which motivate young consumers to purchase luxury fashion were discussed. Specifically, Park et al. (2008) found that purchase frequency was the most effective factor, followed by conformity and age, then racial superiority, social recognition, and pocket money came last. Vanity did not have a significant relation with luxury consumption. Although the researchers examined different determinants for specific consumers, some important purchasing factors still need to be investigated. Indeed, their study did not examine some individual and functional aspects.

Highlighting external and internal motivation for purchasing luxury brands, Yann (2010) focused on personal aspirations and the consumption of luxury goods. He tested a model of the effects of external and internal personal aspirations on consumer decision making in the luxury products market. He found that external aspirations are significantly related to quality search, while the internal aspirations are related to self-pleasure (Yann, 2010). He suggested that brand retailers should consider both internal and external consumer motivations in the design of their marketing advertising to improve brand loyalty in the long run. This study showed the impact of extrinsic aspirations on purchasing decisions. Extrinsic aspirations have a greater effect on buying luxury products than personal aspirations (Yann, 2010).

Bruno et al. (2012) conducted a study in different countries, including Japan, China, France, Italy, India, Russia, and the United States, about the effects of brand and country-of-origin on consumers' decision to purchase luxury products. This study investigated the relationship between the country of origin and luxury purchase decision. This study includes a richly multicultural analysis from different countries all over the world. The result shows the importance of consumers' provenance on the luxury purchasing decision,
and the consumer’s purchasing decision depends on the maturity of the market (Bruno et al., 2012).

Although this study was conducted in seven different countries with different cultures, it does not compare cultures regarding their attitudes toward collectivism and individualism. For marketing implications, there is an urgent need to understand consumer’s consumption values for luxury products, as there has been growth in the consumption of luxury products globally. Thus, consumers may value luxury products differently based on the cultural feature of collectivism and individualism. Given these cultural differences, it is imperative that marketers of global luxury brands understand what these divers consumers value, in order to market to them more effectively. This study will address this gap. Thus, the next section is the conceptual framework and the hypotheses for this dissertation research.

2.6 Conceptual framework

As previously stated, the main research question of this study is: Do individualist and collectivist consumers value luxury brands differently? To answer this question, several relationships have to be investigated: the relationships between luxury values (functional, social, and individual) and attitude. Past research has examined the relationship between luxury values, attitude and luxury purchase intention (Han et al., 2010; Miremadi et al., 2011; Yann, 2010). Moreover, culture dimensions (individualism and collectivism) and consumer guilt were tested to clarify whether they act as moderating variables. Previous research studies have shown how consumers from collectivist and individualist cultures value products differently (Muk et al. 2014; Lee and
Based on the research question and the review of the literature, the proposed conceptual model was designed as shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 3. Proposed Model**

### 2.7 Hypotheses

Based on the literature review, the following hypotheses were developed:

H1: There are relationships between a) quality value and luxury purchase intention and b) uniqueness value and luxury purchase intention.

H2: There are relationships between a) social status value and luxury purchase intention and b) conspicuous value and luxury purchase intention.
H3 There are relationships between a) self-identity and luxury purchase intention, b) self-directed pleasure and luxury purchase intention, and c) self-esteem and luxury purchase intention.

H4a: The relationship between quality value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension (collectivism vs. individualism) and consumer guilt.

H4b: The relationship between uniqueness value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.

H5a: The relationship between social status value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.

H5b) The relationship between conspicuous value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.

H6a) The relationship between self-identify and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.

H6b) the relationship between self-directed pleasure and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.

H6c) the relationship between self-esteem and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.

H7a: The relationship between quality value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.

H7b: The relationship between uniqueness value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.
H8a: The relationship between social status value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.

H8b: The relationship between conspicuous value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.

H9a: The relationship between self-identify and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.

H9b: The relationship between self-directed pleasure and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.

H9c: The relationship between self-esteem and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.

2.8 Summary

In this chapter, I provided an overview of the research related to the topics of luxury, individualism, collectivism, luxury values (functional, social, and individual), consumer guilt, attitude and luxury purchase intention. The proposed model and the hypotheses were presented, and the gaps between the literature and the current study were highlighted.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I discuss how the research was conducted. I provide an overview of the research methodology, and the sample that was collected for this study is identified. In addition, the methods that were used to collect data are discussed, and an in-depth overview of the procedure and data analysis is provided.

3.1 Sampling

Because this study compares two different cultures, samples were collected from two countries—the United States of America and Saudi Arabia. University students are the target for this study in both countries, as they provide a good sample of the community. Furthermore, the reason why university students are chosen to be the target for this study is because young consumers have increasing demands for luxury brands (Park et al. 2008). The United States participants were chosen from one of the largest universities in the southeastern United States, where the researcher currently resides. In Saudi Arabia, the participants were chosen from one of the universities in the researcher’s hometown.

The research was conducted through a web-based survey. The Qualtrics online survey tool was employed. The link for the questionnaire was sent in an e-mail message to both universities based on a random sample consisting of graduate and undergraduate, male and female, Saudi and American students. The number of the participants was 478 in total: 171 for the United States and 277 for Saudi Arabia. The participants were over 18 years of age, which is the lowest age for university students for undergraduate and graduate students.
3.2 Measurement

As noted above, the purpose of this study is to examine the differences between individualists and collectivists in valuing luxury products. A questionnaire survey that was designed to investigate those differences, included five parts. The first part includes items designed to investigate the participants’ level of individualism and collectivism. The second part includes items designed to measure the variables of luxury values, including functional (quality and uniqueness), social (social status and conspicuous consumption), and individual values (self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem). The third part includes items designed to examine consumers’ guilt. The fourth part consists of items designed to examine attitude and purchase intention. Finally, the last part includes demographic data of the participants: age, sex, race, income, and level of education.

Various scales were adopted to address the objectives of this study. For the variables of individualism and collectivism, the Li and Aksoy (2007) scale was applied. This scale was applied in the Li and Aksoy study to investigate both vertical and horizontal dimensions for individualism and collectivism variables. In the current study, vertical and horizontal dimensions were combined into one scale, as there is no need to divide the scale into two dimensions. An example of a collectivism scale measurement is “Parents and children must stay together as much as possible,” and an example of an individualism scale measurement is “It is important that I do my job better than others.”

Several variables of luxury values were examined. Three core values were investigated through different scales. First, functional values, which include quality and
uniqueness, were addressed. The quality measurement was adopted from the Truong and McColl (2011) study. Their scale fits this study because it provides an exact measurement of the perceived luxury quality. An example of an item from their scale that measures quality is “Product quality superiority is my major reason for buying a luxury brand.” The Bian and Forsythe (2012) scale was used to measure uniqueness. The scale consists of questions designed to investigate three main dimensions: creative, unpopular choice, and similarity. An example of an item from this scale is “I’m often on the lookout for new products or brands that will add to my personal uniqueness.”

Two main social value dimensions were tested: social status and conspicuous consumption. The social status scale, adopted from Yong Eng (2012), investigates whether a luxury brand represents the individual’s social status and lifestyle; for example, “Luxury brands symbolize one’s social status.” The scale of Truong and McColl (2011) was used to measure conspicuous consumption. The scale consists of questions designed to test the conspicuous consumption of luxury brands, such as “Product prestige is my major reason for buying a luxury brand.”

Three main individual values were tested: self-identity, self-directed pleasure, and self-esteem. To measure the self-identity dimension, the scale of the Wiedmann, Hennigs and Siebels (2009) study was adopted. The measurement was originally designed to measure self-identity specifically related to luxury consumption. An example of an item designed to measure self-identity is “I never buy a luxury brand inconsistent with the characteristics with which I describe myself.” Self-directed pleasure is the second individual value, and the Truong and McColl (2011) scale was adopted for this purpose. An example of an item on this scale is “I buy a luxury brand only because it pleases me,
so I do not care about whether it pleases others.” Self-esteem is the last dimension of individual values. The Malär et al. (2011) scale, which measures self-esteem in general, was adopted. An example of this scale is “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.”

To investigate consumer guilt, the Özhan-Dedeoğlu and Kazancoğlu (2012) measurement was applied. This scale was designed to measure the anticipatory guilt in particular. An example of an item to measure consumer guilt is “Anticipating a future regret makes me behave more responsibly during shopping”.

To measure the participants’ attitudes toward luxury products, the Loureiro and Araújo (2014) scale was adopted. This scale was originally designed to measure a specific luxury brand; however, in this study, it was changed to measure attitudes toward luxury products in general. An example of an item to measure attitude toward luxury is “I buy luxury brands because they provide many benefits (e.g., quality, designer, fashion, status, etc.).”

To study the luxury purchase intention dimension, the measurement of Shukla and Purani (2012) was adopted. This scale was designed to measure the intention of purchasing a luxury accessories brand. Some changes were applied so this scale can fit luxury products in general. An example of an item to measure luxury purchase intention is “I purchase luxury brands to show who I am.”

The questionnaire used in this study has a total of 54 questions, consisting of 16 questions on individualism and collectivism, ten questions on functional value (three on quality and seven on need for uniqueness), seven questions on social value (four on social status and three on conspicuous consumption), ten questions on individual value (three on self-identity, three on directed pleasure, and four on self-esteem), two questions on
consumer guilt, four questions on attitude toward luxury, and five questions on luxury purchase intention. Each construct of this study was measured by answers on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). A summary of the variables scales used in this study is presented in Table1.

Table 1
The variables scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism and Collectivism scale</td>
<td>Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The well-being of my coworkers is important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To me, pleasure is spending time with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I feel good when I cooperate with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is important that I do my job better than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Winning is everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Competition is the law of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I’d rather depend on myself than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I often do ‘‘my own things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality scale</td>
<td>• Product quality superiority is my major reason for buying a luxury brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I place emphasis on quality assurance over prestige when considering the purchase of a luxury brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A luxury brand preferred by many people that does not meet my quality standards will never enter into my purchasing considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for uniqueness scale</td>
<td>• I'm often on the lookout for new products or brands that will add to my personal uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having an eye for products that are interesting and unusual assists me in establishing a distinctive image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I often try to find a more interesting version of run-of-the-mill products because I enjoy being original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I often dress unconventionally even when it's likely to offend others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If someone hinted that I had been dressing inappropriately for a social situation, I would continue dressing in the same manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I dislike brands or products that are customarily purchased by everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I often try to avoid products or brands that I know are bought by the general population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social status scale</strong></td>
<td>• Luxury brands symbolize one’s social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luxury brands represent the latest lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luxury brands signify one’s trendy image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luxury brands associated with the symbol of prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong Eng, T. (2012). Psychological and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural insight into consumption of luxury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western brand in India. Journal of customer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior vol. 9 no. 1 p.55-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conspicuous consumption behavior scale</strong></td>
<td>• Product prestige is my major reason for buying a luxury brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truong, Y., &amp; McColl, R. (2011). Intrinsic</td>
<td>• It is important for me that the luxury brand I buy improves my image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivations, self-esteem, and luxury goods</td>
<td>• The luxury brand I purchase must be a status symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumption. *Journal Of Retailing &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Services, 18(6), 555-561.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-identity scale</strong></td>
<td>• I never buy a luxury brand inconsistent with the characteristics with which I describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedmann, K., Hennigs, N., &amp; Siebels, A.</td>
<td>myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009). Value-based segmentation of luxury</td>
<td>• The luxury brands I buy must match what and who I really am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumption behavior. *Psychology &amp; Marketing,</td>
<td>• My choice of luxury brands depends on whether they reflect how I see myself but not how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26(7), 625-651.</td>
<td>others see me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-directed pleasure Scale</strong></td>
<td>• I buy a luxury brand only because it pleases me, so I do not care about whether it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivations, self-esteem, and luxury goods</td>
<td>• I tend to concentrate consumption on my own pleasure rather than others', so I consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumption. *Journal Of Retailing &amp;</td>
<td>only my own pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Services, 18(6), 555-561.</td>
<td>• I can enjoy luxury brands entirely on my own terms, no matter what others may feel about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem scale</strong></td>
<td>• On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malår, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W. D., &amp;</td>
<td>• I feel that I am a person of worth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyffenegger, B. (2011). Emotional Brand</td>
<td>• All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure. (Reversed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment and Brand Personality: The Relative</td>
<td>• I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the Actual and the Ideal Self.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal Of Marketing, 75(4), 35-52.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer guilt scale</strong></td>
<td>• Anticipating a future regret makes me behave more responsibly during shopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not buy expensive products in order to avoid guilt feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude scale</strong></td>
<td>• I buy clothes from this brand because I have many benefits (e.g., quality, designer, is fashion, status, etc..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luxury clothes of this brand satisfy my needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This luxury brand helps to show my social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In general, I am happy with the clothes of this luxury brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luxury purchase intention scale</strong></td>
<td>• I purchase luxury brand to show who I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would buy a luxury brand just because it has status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Owning luxury brands indicate a symbol of wealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would pay more for a luxury brand if it has status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luxury brands are important to me because they make me feel more acceptable in my work circle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Procedure

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained before conducting this study.

After approval was obtained, the surveys were distributed randomly via student e-mail.

The survey was conducted online between April 2015 and May 2015. For this cross-
cultural study, two equivalent surveys were conducted in two cultural contexts; one was conducted in the United States and the other in Saudi Arabia. For the US sample, the survey was distributed among students from the departments of Human Ecology, Chemistry and Business. For Saudi sample, it was sent to students of the department of Home Economics, Business and Education. The survey was written in both English and Arabic. Because the research was originally written in English, the Saudi questionnaire was also written in English, and then translated to the researcher’s native language (Arabic). The questionnaire was translated by the researcher and reviewed by The Middle East Office for Translation. The survey was also reviewed by an expert of Arabic linguistics. A pretest was conducted to ensure that the survey was translated correctly. During this pretest, six Saudi students who speak both Arabic and English languages took the survey. Thereafter, they edited some questions, and based on their revision, the last draft of the survey was built.

3.4 Data analysis

This study was designed as a quantitative study to investigate the differences between how cultures value luxury brands. The collected data was entered and analyzed using SPSS and SPSS AMOS version 21. Different statistical tests were extracted using SPSS. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations) were computed for the whole sample and separately for the American and Saudi samples. For introductory analysis, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to measure the internal consistency reliability of the measures used in this research. In terms of descriptive statistics, the collected demographic data collected in both the United States and Saudi Arabia were used to report the demographic configurations of the study participants.
For data screening, the accuracy and quality of the data collected was tested using redundancies to ensure that the surveys were collected and entered appropriately for all subjects. The kind of missing data was checked and handled by AMOS. In order to ensure that the model is a good fit to the data, the normality was examined to assure that the multivariate distribution was normally distributed. Specifically, skewness and kurtosis were examined. In order to examine relationships among study variables, correlation analysis was applied. Specifically, bivariate correlations coefficient was carried out to examine the relationships. The absence of outliers was also checked. Both univariate and multivariate outliers were examined. A univariate outlier was represented when the participants were extreme on only one variable. A multivariate outlier represents that when participants have two or more extreme scores on unusual formation of scores (Weston & Gore, 2006).

The tool that was used primarily in this study is Structural Equation Modelling. Because there are several independent variables and one dependent variable, structural equation modelling (SEM) is the most appropriate tool (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). The SEM was conducted as follows: first, the model specification was done by drawing a picture using AMOS software. SPSS Amos version 21 was used for both path analysis and structural equation modeling SEM in this study. Comparing with other softwares, AMOS has several advantages. It obtains direct and indirect effects, uses multilevel and multi group analysis and deals with categorical indicators and latent class analysis (Muthen & Muthen, 2002). The direct relationship between luxury values and purchase intention was addressed. The moderating variables were culture dimension and consumer’s guilt and the mediating variable is the attitude toward luxury brand. The data
was built from raw data that are in the form of correlation matrix. Second, parameters of the postulated model were estimated by AMOS. Thus, parameters were left free in order to consider implications of estimated parameters (Weston & Gore, 2006). Third, the model’s fit to the data was evaluated to determine whether the associations among measured and latent variables in the model adequately reflect the observed associations in the data. According to Hu & Bentler (1998; 1999), three types of fit indices should be examined: absolute, parsimonious and incremental. Absolute fit indices indicates how well the model-implied covariance match the observed covariances. To assess absolute, parsimonious and incremental model fit, the Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) were used.

Consumer guilt, individualism and collectivism were entered into the equation to determine whether they moderate the relationship between luxury values and luxury purchase intention. The moderator is a variable that impacts the direction and/or strength of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Attitude, on the other hand, entered the equation as a mediating variable to explain the nature of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

AMOS does not readily handle moderation between latent and manifest variables. To address this in this study, two groups were compared (Saudi and US students) by assessing their means through the SPSS tool. For both of them I found the means on each of the moderator variables. For each, I created a variable that is coded 1 for those above the mean and 0 for those below the mean. I treated these new variables in multigroup analysis to test for changes in the structural coefficients based on these new groups.
3.5 Summary

In this chapter, the data collection methods were explained and an in-depth overview of the research measurement was provided. Finally, the study procedures and data analysis tools were discussed.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

In the current chapter, the preliminary screening procedures will first be described. Following this, the statistics describing the sample and study variables will be presented. Lastly, the results testing the hypotheses will be summarized.

4.1 Preliminary Screening Procedures

4.1.1 Screening for Normality

Mean composites were created for Quality Value, Uniqueness, Social Status, Conspicuousness, Self-Identity, Self-Directed Pleasure, and Self-Esteem; these mean composites were evaluated for normality. Given that the constructs (Attitude toward Luxury Brands and Luxury Purchase Intention) were going to be measured using individual items, the individual items were tested for normality.

Per Kline (2011), a variable is normally distributed if its skewness index (i.e., skewness statistic/standard error) is less than three and if its kurtosis index (i.e., kurtosis statistic/standard error) is less than 20. Seven of the variables were highly skewed and thus transformed using a natural log function.

Table 2
Skewness and Kurtosis Statistics for the Study Variables (N = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes toward luxury brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luxury purchase intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. SE for skewness = .12. SE for kurtosis = .23.*

4.1.2 Screening for Outliers

Univariate outliers. Univariate outliers were detected by first standardizing the variables. Cases whose standardized values fell above the absolute value of 3.29 were deemed to be univariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). None of the cases had values above the absolute value of 3.29; therefore, there were no univariate outliers.

Multivariate outliers. Multivariate outliers were detected via the Mahalanobis $D^2$ values yielded by the AMOS 21 program. Per Byrne (2010), a case is a multivariate outlier if its $D^2$ value is high relative to the $D^2$ values of the other cases. Six cases met this criterion and were thus deleted from the data set.
4.2 Descriptive Statistics

4.2.1 Description of Sample

The findings in Table 3 reveal that within the United States sample, there was an almost equal proportion of male (52%) and female respondents (48%). The majority of respondents were between 18 and 24 years old (74.9%) and Caucasian (60.2%). Thirty-eight percent earned less than $25,000 and 29.2% earned more than $100,000 annually.

Within the Saudi sample, the majority of the respondents were female (97.1%). Close to half of the sample consisted of 18 to 24 year olds (47.7%); 39% were between 25 and 30 years old. The majority of respondents were Arab (97.5%). Twenty-eight percent earned less than $25,000, and 20.9% earned more than $100,000 annually as household income.

Table 3  
Frequencies and Percentages for the Variables Describing the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Whole Sample</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N = 478$ ($%$)</td>
<td>$N = 171$ ($%$)</td>
<td>$N = 277$ ($%$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>351 (78.3)</td>
<td>82 (48.0)</td>
<td>269 (97.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97 (21.7)</td>
<td>89 (52.0)</td>
<td>8 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>260 (58.0)</td>
<td>128 (74.9)</td>
<td>132 (47.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>137 (30.6)</td>
<td>29 (17.0)</td>
<td>108 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>40 (8.9)</td>
<td>10 (5.8)</td>
<td>30 (10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 or older</td>
<td>11 (2.5)</td>
<td>4 (2.4)</td>
<td>7 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Whole Sample</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N = 478 )</td>
<td>( N = 171 )</td>
<td>( N = 277 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>105 (23.4)</td>
<td>103 (60.2)</td>
<td>2 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Caucasian</td>
<td>71 (15.8)</td>
<td>66 (38.6)</td>
<td>5 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>272 (60.7)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>270 (97.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>142 (31.7)</td>
<td>65 (38.0)</td>
<td>77 (27.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>104 (23.2)</td>
<td>31 (18.1)</td>
<td>73 (26.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>94 (21.0)</td>
<td>25 (14.6)</td>
<td>69 (24.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>108 (24.1)</td>
<td>50 (29.2)</td>
<td>58 (20.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2 Description of Brand Purchase Intention

As shown in Table 4, the top three luxury brands within the United States sample were Ralph Lauren (63.2%), Calvin Klein (63.2%), and Michael Kors (57.3%). Within the Saudi Arabian sample, the top three luxury brands participants plan to purchase were Chanel (49.5%), Christian Dior (39.7%), and Louis Vuitton (35.7%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Whole Sample</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N = 478$</td>
<td>$N = 171$</td>
<td>$N = 277$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gucci</td>
<td>178 (39.7%)</td>
<td>93 (54.4%)</td>
<td>85 (30.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanel</td>
<td>212 (47.3%)</td>
<td>75 (43.9%)</td>
<td>137 (49.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Dior</td>
<td>166 (37.1%)</td>
<td>56 (32.7%)</td>
<td>110 (39.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Vuitton</td>
<td>191 (42.6%)</td>
<td>92 (53.8%)</td>
<td>99 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgio Armani</td>
<td>136 (30.4%)</td>
<td>76 (44.4%)</td>
<td>60 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prada</td>
<td>144 (32.1%)</td>
<td>64 (37.4%)</td>
<td>80 (28.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burberry</td>
<td>117 (26.1%)</td>
<td>51 (29.8%)</td>
<td>66 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany &amp; Co.</td>
<td>147 (32.8%)</td>
<td>81 (47.4%)</td>
<td>66 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartier</td>
<td>124 (27.7%)</td>
<td>36 (21.1%)</td>
<td>88 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>84 (18.8%)</td>
<td>37 (21.6%)</td>
<td>47 (17.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Lauren</td>
<td>169 (37.7%)</td>
<td>108 (63.2%)</td>
<td>61 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolce and Gabbanna</td>
<td>139 (31.0%)</td>
<td>61 (35.7%)</td>
<td>78 (28.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferragamo</td>
<td>56 (12.5%)</td>
<td>24 (14.0%)</td>
<td>32 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Klein</td>
<td>172 (38.4%)</td>
<td>108 (63.2%)</td>
<td>64 (23.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fendi</td>
<td>127 (28.3%)</td>
<td>40 (23.4%)</td>
<td>87 (31.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>65 (14.5%)</td>
<td>21 (12.3%)</td>
<td>44 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moschino</td>
<td>58 (12.9%)</td>
<td>19 (11.1%)</td>
<td>39 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Louboutin</td>
<td>84 (18.3%)</td>
<td>49 (28.7%)</td>
<td>35 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Choo</td>
<td>65 (14.5%)</td>
<td>42 (24.6%)</td>
<td>23 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kors</td>
<td>178 (39.7%)</td>
<td>98 (57.3%)</td>
<td>80 (28.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManoloBlahnik</td>
<td>40 (8.9%)</td>
<td>25 (14.6%)</td>
<td>15 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Description of the Study Variables

Per Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), a measure is reliable if Cronbach’s alpha is .70 or higher. As shown in Table 5, Cronbach’s alpha for most of the scales were acceptable or close to acceptable. Note that because alpha for the Guilt measure (that consisted of two items) was unacceptable at .46, only the second item was used to measure guilt. Initial alpha for the Quality Value measure was .60; when the third item was dropped, alpha increased to .65. Initial alpha for the Self-Esteem measure was .72; when the reverse-coded third item was dropped, alpha increased to .76. Initial alpha for the Attitude toward Luxury Brands measure was only .59; when the third item was dropped, alpha increased to .64.

Note that although the mean Collectivism score for the Saudi Arabian sample ($M = 4.09, SD = .41$) was somewhat higher than that of the United States sample ($M = 3.80, SD = .60$), the mean Individualism scores were similar. The mean Social Status score for the United States sample was somewhat higher ($M = 3.47, SD = .81$) than that of the Saudi Arabian sample ($M = 3.03, SD = .82$). On the other hand, the mean Self-Identity ($M = 4.06, SD = .74$) and Self-Directed Pleasure scores ($M = 4.07, SD = .77$) for the Saudi Arabian sample was somewhat higher than that of the United States sample ($M = 3.63, SD = .79$ for Self-Identity; $M = 3.76, SD = .81$ for Self-Directed Pleasure). Although the mean Attitude toward Luxury Brands score for the Saudi Arabian sample ($M = 3.88, SD = .59$) was higher than that of the United States sample ($M = 3.66, SD = .62$), their mean Intent score ($M = 2.52, SD = .87$) was lower than the mean Intent score of the United States sample ($M = 3.05, SD = .83$).
Table 5
Descriptive Statistics and Cronbach’s Alpha for the Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Whole Sample</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 478</td>
<td>N = 171</td>
<td>N = 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α  M        SD</td>
<td>α  M        SD</td>
<td>α  M        SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>.74 3.98 (.52)</td>
<td>.81 3.80 (.60)</td>
<td>.61 4.09 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>.69 3.64 (.53)</td>
<td>.74 3.65 (.58)</td>
<td>.65 3.63 (.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>-- 3.22 (1.13)</td>
<td>-- 3.13 (1.15)</td>
<td>-- 3.27 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>.65 3.81 (.81)</td>
<td>.61 3.85 (.77)</td>
<td>.67 3.79 (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>.72 3.01 (.65)</td>
<td>.80 3.08 (.70)</td>
<td>.65 2.96 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>.76 3.20 (.84)</td>
<td>.78 3.47 (.81)</td>
<td>.72 3.03 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>.73 2.96 (.90)</td>
<td>.76 3.04 (.90)</td>
<td>.71 2.91 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>.78 3.90 (.79)</td>
<td>.75 3.63 (.79)</td>
<td>.76 4.06 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed</td>
<td>.79 3.95 (.80)</td>
<td>.72 3.76 (.81)</td>
<td>.82 4.07 (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.72 4.16 (.63)</td>
<td>.78 4.16 (.70)</td>
<td>.69 4.15 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward</td>
<td>.64 3.80 (.61)</td>
<td>.63 3.66 (.62)</td>
<td>.61 3.88 (.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luxury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury purchase</td>
<td>.85 2.72 (.90)</td>
<td>.81 3.05 (.83)</td>
<td>.85 2.52 (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Correlations between the Study Variables

**Whole sample.** As shown in Table 6, Collectivism was negatively associated with Uniqueness ($r = -.11, p < .01$) and Luxury Purchase Intention ($r = -.14, p < .01$) but positively correlated with Self-Identity ($r = .14, p < .01$), Self-Esteem ($r = .18, p < .001$), and Attitudes toward Luxury brands ($r = .13, p < .01$). Individualism was positively associated with all the measures except for Guilt and Luxury Purchase Intention.

**United States sample.** The findings in Table 7 reveal that Collectivism was negatively associated with Guilt ($r = -.23, p < .01$) and uniqueness ($r = -.18, p < .05$) but
positively correlated with Status ($r = .20, p < .05$) and Self-Esteem ($r = .16, p < .05$). Individualism was positively associated with most of the measures except for Guilt, Conspicuousness, and Luxury Purchase Intention.

**Saudi Arabian sample.** The findings in Table 8 indicate that Collectivism was positively correlated with Self-Identity ($r = .18, p < .01$), Self-Esteem ($r = .23, p < .001$), and Attitudes toward Luxury Brands ($r = .15, p < .05$). Individualism was positively associated with all the measures except for Guilt, status, and Luxury Purchase Intention.

4.4 Results of the Hypotheses Tests

4.4.1 Procedure

Prior to testing the proposed structural model, the measurement model was tested via a confirmatory factor analysis using the AMOS 21 program. Model fit was assessed via the chi-square statistic and the fit indices (per Kline, 2011) shown in Table 9. The coefficients were assessed at an alpha of .05. Then, an exploratory factor analysis was run to see what would be produced without any prior predictions from the measurement model. This is reported in a note after Figure 5.

**Testing for mediation.** Per Kline (2011), a variable is deemed a mediator when the following criteria are met: the independent variable significantly predicts the mediator; the mediator significantly predicts the dependent variable; and the indirect effect is statistically significant but the direct effect is not statistically significant. If the direct effect continues to be significant then the mediation would be partial. Bootstrapping procedures ($N = 1000$ bootstrap samples) were conducted to determine the significance of the direct and indirect effects.
Table 6
Pearson Correlations between the Study Variables for the Whole Sample (N = 448)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20 ***</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.19 ***</td>
<td>.11  *</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12  *</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14 **</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.22 ***</td>
<td>.32 ***</td>
<td>.63 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identity</td>
<td>.14 **</td>
<td>1.18 ***</td>
<td>.11 *</td>
<td>.23 ***</td>
<td>.13 **</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directed Pleasure</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18 ***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31 ***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.17 ***</td>
<td>-.15 **</td>
<td>.52 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.18 ***</td>
<td>.18 ***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.25 ***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11 *</td>
<td>.27 ***</td>
<td>.31 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.13 **</td>
<td>.20 ***</td>
<td>-.21 ***</td>
<td>.11  *</td>
<td>.19 ***</td>
<td>.31 ***</td>
<td>.29 ***</td>
<td>.19 ***</td>
<td>.20 ***</td>
<td>.22 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>-.14 **</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.24 ***</td>
<td>.37 ***</td>
<td>.60 ***</td>
<td>.68 ***</td>
<td>-.16 **</td>
<td>-.26 ***</td>
<td>-.14 **</td>
<td>.16 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001
Table 7
Pearson Correlations between the Study Variables for the United States Sample (N = 171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Individualism</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Guilt</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Quality</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Uniqueness</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Social Status</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conspicuousness</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Self-Identity</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Self-Directed Pleasure</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Attitude</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Purchase Intention</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Individualism</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21 **</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23 ***</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Social Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conspicuousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Self-Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Self-Directed Pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Purchase Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Testing for moderation. To test for moderation, simultaneous group analyses were conducted (Byrne, 2010): United States vs. Saudi Arabia, low Collectivism vs. high Collectivism, low Individualism vs. high Individualism, and low Guilt vs. high Guilt. In the simultaneous group analyses, the two groups were compared and all parameters were free to vary; this served as the baseline model. Thereafter, the path between the exogenous variable or construct to the endogenous construct was fixed; the chi-square statistic of this model was compared to the chi-square statistic of the baseline model. If the change in chi-square between the two models exceeded 3.84 (i.e., the critical chi-square for one degree of freedom), it was assumed that the path coefficients differed across groups and that the specific relationship was moderated by the factor under consideration.

4.4.2 Findings for the Proposed Measurement Model

The initial test of the proposed measurement model resulted with a non-positive definite matrix. Examination of the output revealed that the Functional Value construct was highly correlated with the Social Value, Attitude towards Luxury, and Luxury Purchase Intention constructs. Therefore, the Functional Value and Social Value constructs were collapsed into a single construct. According to Gordon (2012), if the variables are multiple indicators for the same construct and they are strongly correlated, they can be collapsed into a single measure.

The revised measurement model is depicted in Figure 4; its fit indices are summarized in Table 9. The findings reveal that, except for the SRMR, none of the fit indices met their respective threshold values. Thus, the model did not fit the data well.
Accordingly, the model was revised based on two criteria. First, per Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010), standardized factor loadings should be .50 or higher. Therefore, indicator variables whose standardized factor loadings fell below this criterion were deleted; but for purposes of stability (Kline, 2011), indicator variables were not deleted if the construct would only have two indicator variables. Thus, only the Quality Value indicator variable was removed. Second, the modification indices (MI) were examined. Per Byrne (2010), a high MI indicates that the variable is loading onto constructs other than the construct they are hypothesized to load onto. Based on this criterion, the third Luxury Purchase Intention item was deleted (MI = 13.73).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .95</td>
<td>Hu &amp; Bentler, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .95</td>
<td>Hu &amp; Bentler, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>&lt; .06</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Cudeck, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>&lt; .08</td>
<td>Hu &amp; Bentler, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. See Exploratory Factor Analysis Results on pages 73.

The best-fitting measurement model is illustrated in Figure 5; its fit indices are presented in Table 10 and 11. This model fit the data better as most of its index values were close to acceptable. Further, all its indicator variables loaded on significantly to their respective constructs. Therefore, this model was used in subsequent procedures.
Table 10
Fit Indices for the Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Best-Fitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>308.06</td>
<td>173.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability level</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower bound 90% CI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper bound 90% CI</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-close</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for the Best-Fitting Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional and Social Value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.72 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identity</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.65 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directed Pleasure</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.77 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.60 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 2</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.77 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent 1</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.75 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent 2</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.70 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent 4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.77 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent 5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Figure 4. Standardized coefficients for the revised measurement model.
Figure 5. Standardized coefficients for the best-fitting measurement model.
4.4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis on the Measurement Model

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was run to see what would be produced in a measurement model without any prior predictions for the model in Figure 4 above. An EFA was run for the full sample (\(N = 448\)), United States only (\(n = 171\)), and Saudi Arabian sample (\(n = 227\)).

Initial Diagnostics

The full sample. The KMO was greater than .5 at .855 (\(N = 448\)). Kaiser (1974) stated that that values between values between .7 and .8 are good and give confidence that the sample size (\(N=448\)) was good enough for the EFA. Bartlett’s Measure tests the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix is an identity matrix. The test was statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. This means there are some correlational relationships between the variables to include in the analysis. Bartlett’s test was significant at 2309.613, \(p < .0001\).

The United States sample. The KMO was .812 (\(N = 171\)). Kaiser (1974) stated that that values between values between .7 and .8 are good and give confidence that the sample size was good enough for the EFA. Bartlett’s Measure tests the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix is an identity matrix. The test was statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. This means there are some correlational relationships between the variables to include in the analysis. Bartlett’s test was significant at 872.535, \(p < .0001\).

The Saudi Arabian sample. The KMO was .812 (\(N = 277\)). Values between values between .7 and .8 are good and give confidence that the sample size was good enough for the EFA. Bartlett’s Measure tests the null hypothesis that the original
correlation matrix is an identity matrix. The test was statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. This means there are some correlational relationships between the variables to include in the analysis. Bartlett’s test was significant at 1537.678, \( p < .0001 \).

**Eigenvalues, Variance, and Scree Plot**

**The full sample.** There were three eigenvalues greater than 1 found when the principle components analysis (PCA) was run which suggests a three factor solution and this agreed with the scree plot (\( N = 448 \)). The first component had an eigenvalue of 4.665 and explained 31.103\% of the variance followed by the second component had an eigenvalue of 2.512 with 16.746\% of the variance explained and the third component had an eigenvalue of 1.163 with 7.753\% of the variance explained. This PCA accounted for a total of 55.602\% of the measurement model variance in a three factor solution.

**The United States sample.** There were four eigenvalues greater than 1 found when the principle components analysis (PCA) was run which suggests a four factor solution which agrees with the scree plot (\( N = 171 \)). The first component had an eigenvalue of 4.596 and explained 30.604\% of the variance followed by the second component had an eigenvalue of 2.187 with 14.579\% of the variance explained, the third component had an eigenvalue of 1.569 with 10.458\% of the variance explained, and the fourth component had an eigenvalue of 1.064 with 7.091\% of the variance explained. This PCA accounted for a total of 62.768\% of the measurement model variance in a four factor solution.

**The Saudi Arabian sample.** There were three eigenvalues greater than 1 found when the principle components analysis (PCA) was run which suggests a three factor
solution and this agreed with the scree plot \((N = 277)\). The first component had an eigenvalue of 4.820 and explained 32.186% of the variance followed by the second component had an eigenvalue of 2.709 with 18.602% of the variance explained and the third component had an eigenvalue of 1.064 with 7.093% of the variance explained. This PCA accounted for a total of 57.291% of the measurement model variance in a three factor solution.

**Measurement Model from EFA**

The full sample. A varimax rotation \((N = 448)\) was used to clarify item loadings into the three factor solution in Table X. The functional and social value factor did not hold up in the EFA. The factors of Individual Value, Luxury Attitudes, and Luxury Intent to Purchase all held with their initial defining questions. The conspicuous, status, and unique items loaded onto Luxury Intent to Purchase Factor and the TQuality item loaded onto the Individual Value Factor.

Table 12
Varimax Rotated Solution for the Full Sample \((N = 448)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention 5</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention 1</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSPIC</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention 4</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention 2</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention 3</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The United States sample. A varimax rotation ($N = 171$) was used to clarify item loadings into the four factor solution in Table XI. The four factors in the measurement model of Functional and Social Value, Individual Value, Luxury Attitudes, and Luxury Intent to Purchase all held with their most of their initial defining questions. The conspicuous and status items loaded again into the Luxury Intent to Purchase Factor, Luxury Attitudes did not change, Individual Value kept two items and had the unique item load into it. Finally, the items of Testeem and the TQuality loaded into and unknown factor.

Table 13
Varimax Rotated Solution for The measurement Model with The United States Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUXE3</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSPIC</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE4</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE2</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE5</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE1</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATT2</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATT1</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATT4</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDIRECT</td>
<td></td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESTEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

The Saudi Arabian sample. A varimax rotation \( (N = 277) \) was used to clarify item loadings into the three factor solution in Table XII. The functional and social value factor did not hold up in the EFA. The factors of Individual Value, Luxury Attitudes, and Luxury Intent to Purchase mostly held with their initial defining questions. The conspicuous, status, and unique items loaded onto Luxury Intent to Purchase Factor again. Luxury attitudes held its three questions and added Testeem. Individual Value held two of its items and added the TQuality item.
Table 14
Varimax Rotated Solution for The measurement Model with The Saudi Arabian Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUXE5</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSPIC</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE1</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE4</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE3</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXE2</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATT4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATT2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATT1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESTEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDIRECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

4.4.4 Findings for the Structural Model

The structural model is depicted in Figure 6. As shown in Table 12, this model had a close to acceptable fit. The findings in Table 13 reveal that Functional and Social Value positively predicted Attitudes toward Luxury, $\beta = .57, p < .001$; it also significantly
predicted Luxury Purchase Intentions, $\beta = .95, p < .001$. Individual Value positively predicted Attitudes toward Luxury Brands, $\beta = .41, p < .001$; but it negatively predicted Luxury Purchase Intentions, $\beta = -.13, p < .05$. Lastly, Attitude towards Luxury negatively predicted Luxury Purchase Intentions, $\beta = -.17, p < .05$. The three constructs explained 84.2\% of the variance of Luxury Purchase Intentions.

![Figure 6. Standardized path coefficients for the structural model (whole sample).](image)

**United States.** The structural model for the United States sample is shown in Figure 7. As shown in Table 12, this model had mediocre fit. The findings in Table 13 reveal that Functional and Social Value positively predicted Attitude toward Luxury, $\beta = .52, p < .001$; it also significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intentions, $\beta = .98, p < .001$. Individual Value, however, did not predict Attitude toward Luxury Brands and Luxury Purchase Intention. Likewise, Attitude toward Luxury Brands did not significantly predict Luxury Purchase Intention.
Figure 7. Standardized path coefficients for the structural model (United States).

**Saudi Arabia.** The structural model for the Saudi Arabian sample is shown in Figure 8. As shown in Table 12, this model had close to acceptable fit. The findings in Table 13 reveal that Functional and Social Value positively predicted Attitude toward Luxury Brands, \( \beta = .71, p < .001 \); it also significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intention, \( \beta = .89, p < .001 \). Individual Value positively predicted Attitude toward Luxury Brands, \( \beta = .55, p < .001 \); but it did not significantly predict Luxury Purchase Intention. Similarly, Attitude toward Luxury Brands did not significantly predict Luxury Purchase Intention.

Figure 8. Standardized path coefficients for the structural model (Saudi Arabia).
Table 15
Fit Indices for the Structural Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Whole</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>173.35</td>
<td>151.52</td>
<td>154.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability level</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower bound 90% CI</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper bound 90% CI</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-close</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of countries.** Simultaneous group procedures were conducted to determine whether the path coefficients in the United States sample differed significantly from the path coefficients in the Saudi Arabian sample. The findings in Table 13 reveal that path coefficients did not differ significantly across countries.

From the result it looks like the comparison was between females in Saudi Arabia to both males and females in the US. Since there are so few males in Saudi sample, we cannot make a separate comparison of this group with the males in the US. But, we can compare females in the two countries. Thus, females from Saudi Arabia were compared with females from US.
Table 16
Unstandardized and Standardized Path Coefficients for the Structural Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Whole Sample</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional and Social Value to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.57 ***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.95 ***</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Value to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.41 ***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.13 *</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury to Intention</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.17 *</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Critical Δχ²(1) = 3.84, p < .05.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
4.4.5 Findings for the Structural Model (females only)

**United States.** The structural model for the United States sample is shown in Figure 9. As shown in Table 14, this model had mediocre fit. It also yielded a negative error variance; thus, the solution was not admissible. Therefore, the path coefficients could not be evaluated for significance.

![Standardized path coefficients for the structural model (United States females).](image)

**Saudi Arabia.** The structural model for the Saudi Arabian sample is shown in Figure 10. As shown in Table 14, this model had close to acceptable fit. The findings in Table 15 reveal that Functional and Social Value positively predicted Attitude toward Luxury brands, $\beta = .71, p < .001$; it also significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intention, $\beta = .86, p < .001$. Individual Value positively predicted Attitude toward Luxury Brands, $\beta = .53, p < .001$; but it did not significantly predict Luxury Purchase Intention. Similarly, Attitude toward Luxury Brands did not significantly predict Luxury Purchase Intention.
Figure 10. Standardized path coefficients for the structural model (Saudi Arabian females).

Table 17
Fit Indices for the Structural Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>103.99</td>
<td>150.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability level</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower bound 90% CI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper bound 90% CI</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-close</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Unstandardized and Standardized Path Coefficients for the Structural Model (Saudi Arabian Females Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional and Social Value to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.72  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.86  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Value to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.53  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Purchase Intention</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Luxury to Intention</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

4.4.6 Testing the Mediating Effect of Luxury Brand Attitudes

As noted earlier, a variable is deemed a mediator when the following criteria are met (Kline, 2011): the independent variable significantly predicts the mediator; the mediator significantly predicts the dependent variable; and the indirect effect is statistically significant but the direct effect is not statistically significant. Bootstrapping procedures, with 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (CI) were conducted to determine the significance of the direct and indirect effects.

**Functional and social values.** The findings in Table 13 reveal that Functional and Social Values significantly predicted Attitude toward Luxury, β = .57, p < .001. Thus, the first criterion for mediation was fulfilled. In addition, Attitude toward Luxury Brand significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intentions, β = -.17, p = .05; therefore, the second criterion for mediation was met. As shown in Table 16, the indirect effect of
Functional and Social Values on Purchase Intention was statistically significant ($p<.01$); the third criterion for mediation was fulfilled. But the direct effect was statistically significant ($p<.01$) and the fourth criterion was not met. Therefore, Attitude toward Luxury is a partial mediator of the relationship between Functional and Social Values and Luxury Purchase Intention.

**Individual values.** The findings in Table 13 reveal that Individual Values significantly predicted Attitude toward Luxury, $\beta = .41$, $p<.001$. Thus, the first criterion for mediation was fulfilled. In addition, Attitude toward Luxury significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intention, $\beta = -.17$, $p = .05$; therefore, the second criterion for mediation was met. As shown in Table 16, the indirect effect of Individual Values on Luxury Purchase Intention was statistically significant ($p<.05$); the third criterion for mediation was fulfilled. Further, the direct effect was not statistically significant; thus, the fourth criterion was not met. Therefore, Attitude toward Luxury partially mediated the relationship between Individual Values and Luxury Purchase Intention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19</th>
<th>Standardized Direct and Indirect Effects of the Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional and Social Values on Purchase Intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Values on Purchase Intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<.05$. $** p<.01$. $*** p<.001$
4.4.7 Testing for Moderation

Collectivism. The whole sample was split into two groups; respondents whose mean Collectivism score was four or lower were assigned to the low Collectivism group; those whose mean score was higher than four were assigned to the high Collectivism group. Simultaneous group analyses were then conducted. Because the moderation hypotheses pertained only to the value measures, a different set of models was tested. The models for the low and high Collectivism groups are depicted in Figure 11. The findings in Table 17 reveal that collectivism did not moderate any of relationships between value and Luxury Purchase Intention.

Table 20
Standardized Path Coefficients to Luxury Purchase Intention within Low and High Collectivism Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Low β</th>
<th>High β</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16 **</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>.23 ***</td>
<td>.24 ***</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>.16 *</td>
<td>.31 ***</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>.52 ***</td>
<td>.43 ***</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14 **</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed pleasure</td>
<td>-.14 *</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical Δχ²(1) = 3.84, p< .05.

*p< .05. **p< .01. ***p< .001.
Figure 11. Standardized path coefficients for the low (above) and high (below) collectivism groups.
**Individualism.** The whole sample was split into two groups; respondents whose mean Individualism score was 3.63 or lower were assigned to the low Individualism group; those whose mean score was higher than 3.63 were assigned to the high Individualism group. Simultaneous group analyses were then conducted. The models for the low and high Individualism groups are shown in Figure 12. The findings in Table 18 reveal that Individualism significantly moderated the relationship between

Conspicuousness and Luxury Purchase Intention, $\Delta \chi^2(1) = 6.92, p< .01$. Specifically, the relationship between Conspicuousness and Luxury Purchase Intention was stronger within the high individualism group ($\beta = .59, p< .001$) than it was in the low individualism group ($\beta = .35, p< .001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Low $\beta$</th>
<th>High $\beta$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.15 **</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>.26 ***</td>
<td>.20 ***</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>.29 ***</td>
<td>.17 **</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>.35 ***</td>
<td>.59 ***</td>
<td>6.92 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed pleasure</td>
<td>-.13 *</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Critical $\Delta \chi^2(1) = 3.84, p< .05$. 

*p< .05. **p< .01. ***p< .001.
Figure 12. Standardized path coefficients for the low (above) and high (below) individualism groups.
**Guilt.** The whole sample was split into two groups; respondents whose Guilt score was three or lower were assigned to the low Guilt group; those whose score was higher than three were assigned to the high Guilt group. Simultaneous group analyses were then conducted. The models for the low and high Guilt groups are shown in Figure 13. The findings in Table 19 reveal that Guilt significantly moderated the relationship between Uniqueness and Luxury Purchase Intentions, $\Delta \chi^2(1) = 5.54, p < .05$. Specifically, the relationship between Uniqueness and Luxury Purchase Intention was stronger within the high guilt group ($\beta = .32, p < .001$) than it was in the low guilt group ($\beta = .16, p < .001$).

Table 22
Standardized Path Coefficients to Luxury Purchase Intentions within Low and High Guilt Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Low $\beta$</th>
<th>High $\beta$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>5.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuousness</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed pleasure</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Critical $\Delta \chi^2(1) = 3.84, p < .05$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
Figure 13. Standardized path coefficients for the low (above) and high (below) guilt groups.
4.5 Summary

In this chapter, the screening procedures of normality and outliers were described. The statistics describing the sample, brands purchased and study variables were presented. Also, the correlations between the study variables were examined. In the last section, the results testing the hypothesis were summarized.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The overall objective of this study was to compare Western and Middle Eastern culture regarding consumers’ luxury purchase intention. Most researchers agree that cultural features (individualism and collectivism) impact luxury purchase intention (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Hennigs et al., 2012; Park, Ko, & Kim, 2010; Shukla, 2011; Shukla & Purani, 2012). While most previous studies have compared Western to Eastern culture (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Park, Ko, & Kim, 2010; Shukla, 2011; Shukla & Purani, 2012), this study compared Western culture to Middle Eastern culture (United States vs. Saudi Arabia). In addition, this study addressed the impact of luxury values and luxury purchase intention. Moreover, this study uniquely addressed consumer guilt as a moderating variable and attitude was assessed as a mediating variable.

In this chapter, a discussion of the major findings and hypotheses testing is presented. In the first part of the chapter, the examination of functional, social, and individual values are discussed. Secondly, the impact of the moderating variables of cultural dimension and consumer guilt are assessed in relation to luxury purchase intention. Thirdly, the impact of attitude is discussed as a mediating variable. Finally, the implications of the study are provided, as well as the study’s limitations and suggestions for future research.

5.1 Discussion of Major Findings and Hypotheses Testing

Many studies have focused on Eastern and Western culture in terms of luxury purchase intention. However, this is the first study known to this researcher that focuses on the Middle Eastern culture specifically, while addressing the concept of consumer
guilt. The main research question was *Do individualist and collectivist consumers value luxury brands differently?* Table 20 presents a summary of the results of the hypotheses testing based on this research question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>: There are relationships between a) quality value and luxury purchase intention and b) uniqueness value and luxury purchase intention.</td>
<td>H1a supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>: There are relationships between a) social status value and luxury purchase intention and b) conspicuous value and luxury purchase intention</td>
<td>H2a supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>: There are relationships between a) self-identity and luxury purchase intention, b) self-directed pleasure and luxury purchase intention, and c) self-esteem and luxury purchase intention.</td>
<td>H3a not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4a</strong>: The relationship between quality value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension (collectivism vs. individualism) and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H4a not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4b</strong>: The relationship between uniqueness value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H4b partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5a</strong>: The relationship between social status value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H5a not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5b</strong>: The relationship between conspicuous value and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H5b partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6a</strong>: The relationship between self-identify and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H6a not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6b: The relationship between self-directed pleasure and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H6b not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6c: The relationship between self-esteem and luxury purchase intention is moderated based on the respondent’s cultural dimension and consumer guilt.</td>
<td>H6c not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a: The relationship between quality value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H7a not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b: The relationship between uniqueness value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H7b not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a: The relationship between social status value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H8a not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b: The relationship between conspicuous value and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H8b not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a: The relationship between self-identify and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H9a supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9b: The relationship between self-directed pleasure and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H9b supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9c: The relationship between self-esteem and luxury purchase intention is mediated based on the respondent’s attitude toward luxury.</td>
<td>H9c supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing the hypotheses via structural equation modeling allowed the researcher to assess the relationships among the constructs simultaneously—and thus allowed the researcher to control for all other effects.

It was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between Functional Value (Quality and Uniqueness) and Luxury Purchase Intention (H1). Also, it was hypothesized that there would be a correlation between Social Value (Status and Conspicuousness) and Luxury Purchase Intention (H2). The findings reveal that Functional and Social value significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intention, $\beta = .95, p < .001$. Therefore, the first two hypotheses were supported. This confirmed the previous studies that showed the strong relationship between quality and need for uniqueness and luxury brands (Alireza et al., 2011; Truong & McColl, 2011). This also reinforced the previously stated result that luxury reflects conspicuous consumption and status, and people purchase luxury products mainly to display their wealth (Han et al., 2010; Teck-Yong & Bogaert, 2010). Thus, these results confirm that consumers have a desire to differentiate themselves from others, and may use luxury products to exhibit this. Moreover, the results confirm that quality is a key factor that contributes to purchase intention toward luxury.

It was hypothesized in (H3) that there would be a relationship between Individual Value (Self-Identity, Self-Directed Pleasure, and Self-Esteem) and Luxury Purchase Intention. The findings indicate that Individual Values negatively predicted Luxury Purchase Intentions, $\beta = -.13, p < .05$. Therefore, the third hypothesis was not supported. A previous study of Shukla & Purani (2012) showed that there is a negative relationship between self-directed values and luxury, which supports the findings of this study. However, several studies by Shaw & Shiu (2002) and Mandel & Smeesters (2008)
show a relationship between self-identity and behavioral intention and self-esteem and consumption, respectively. The results of this study show otherwise. Therefore, consumers may not be impacted by individual and emotional values to drive their luxury purchases. In addition, identifying personally with a luxury brand may not solely motivate them to purchase a luxury product.

Hypothesis four (H4a) stated that the relationship between Functional Value (Quality) and Luxury Purchase Intention would be moderated by Cultural Dimension and Consumer Guilt. This hypothesis was not supported, as the findings reveal that Cultural Dimension and Guilt did not moderate the relationship between Quality and Luxury Purchase Intention. This illustrates how quality is a strong variable which may not be impacted by the social theories of individualism and collectivism. Moreover, this result suggests that anticipatory guilt may not be a factor if a consumer perceives a product to be of high quality and worth.

Hypothesis four (H4b) stated that the relationship between Functional Value (Uniqueness) and Luxury Purchase Intention would be moderated by Cultural Dimension and Consumer Guilt. This hypothesis was partially supported. Cultural Dimension did not act as a moderating variable while Guilt moderated the relationship between Uniqueness and Luxury Purchase Intention, \( \Delta \chi^2(1) = 5.54, p < .05 \). The relationship between Uniqueness and Purchase Intention was stronger within the high guilt group (\( \beta = .32, p < .001 \)) than it was in the low guilt group (\( \beta = .16, p < .001 \)). This is consistent with Steenhaut and Kenhove’s (2006) results which showed how the anticipated guilt mediated the relationship between consumers’ ethical beliefs and consumers’ intentions. This confirmed that guilt is a noted factor in the luxury purchase intention process,
especially among the high guilt group, as they had a higher level of uniqueness. That is, because this group desires a higher level of uniqueness and desires a more distinctive product, they may possess more apprehension in anticipation of their purchase.

The fifth hypothesis (H5a) stated that the relationship between Social Value (Social Status) and Luxury Purchase Intention would be moderated by Cultural Dimension and Consumer Guilt. The findings reveal that culture dimension and Guilt did not significantly moderate the relationship between Social Status and Luxury purchase Intention.

The fifth hypothesis (H5b) stated that the relationship between Social Value (Conspicuousness) and Luxury Purchase Intention would be moderated by Cultural Dimension and Consumer Guilt. The findings indicate that Individualism moderated the relationship between Conspicuousness and Luxury Purchase Intention, $\Delta \chi^2(1) = 6.92, p < .01$. The relationship between Conspicuousness and Luxury Purchase Intention was stronger within the high individualism group ($\beta = .59, p < .001$) than it was in the low individualism group ($\beta = .35, p < .001$). Thus, individualistic consumers tend to consume conspicuously more than collectivistic consumers. This result is consistent with Yim et al.’s (2014) study which emphasized that consumers who are more individualistic tend to be more positively responsive toward luxury brands. The need for social status among individualistic consumers is what led them to display their possessions and consume conspicuously. However, the findings suggest that Guilt did not moderate the relationship between Conspicuousness and Luxury purchase Intention. Thus, this hypothesis was partially supported, and suggests that guilt is not a factor among conspicuous
consumption consumers, since their goal is to display their wealth through their luxury products.

It was hypothesized (H6) that the relationship between Individual Value (Self-Identity, Self-Directed Pleasure, and Self-Esteem) and Luxury Purchase Intention would be moderated by Cultural Dimension and Consumer Guilt. The findings reveal that the sixth hypothesis was not supported. Therefore, there is a negative direct and indirect relationship between Individual Value and Luxury Purchase Intention. This is consistent with Hennigs et al. (2012) study which showed a negative impact of individual values on luxury consumption across cultures. As results showed from (H3), there was no relationship between Individual Value and Luxury Purchase Intention. The results from (H6) show that assessing the moderating variables of Culture Dimension and Consumer Guilt did not impact the relationship. Future studies should consider examining this relationship.

Hypotheses seven (H7) and eight (H8) stated that the relationship between Functional and Social Values and Luxury Purchase Intention would be mediated by respondents’ Attitudes toward Luxury. The findings indicate that the seventh and eighth hypotheses were not supported. This result did not support the previous study of Zhang & Kim (2013) which stated that purchase intention for luxury goods were affected by consumers' attitude. Instead, the results of this study suggest that a positive attitude toward luxury does not impact the relationship between Functional and Social Values as it relates to Luxury Purchase Intention. Future studies should consider investigating the relationship between attitude and luxury purchase intention further.
It was hypothesized (H9) that the relationship between Individual Value and Luxury Purchase Intention would be mediated by respondents’ Attitude toward Luxury. The findings reveal that all four criteria for mediation were met. First, Individual Values significantly predicted Attitude toward Luxury, $\beta = .41, p < .001$. In addition, Attitude toward Luxury significantly predicted Luxury Purchase Intention, $\beta = -.17, p = .05$. Further, the indirect effect of Individual Values on Luxury Purchase Intention was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Lastly, the direct effect was not statistically significant. Therefore, Attitude toward Luxury mediated the relationship between Individual Values and Luxury Purchase Intentions. Accordingly, the ninth hypothesis was supported. As previously stated in Zhang & Kim’s (2013) study, Chinese consumers’ purchase intention for luxury fashion goods was affected by their attitude towards buying such goods, which confirms the role of attitude in the relationship between an individual’s value and luxury purchase intention. This suggests that if consumers have a positive attitude toward luxury products, then this may impact their self-oriented values toward their luxury purchase intention.

5.2 Conclusion

With the rise in wealth and disposable income, luxury product consumption has increased globally. By comparing Western and Middle Eastern cultures in terms of consumers’ luxury purchase intention, this can give marketers of luxury brands a greater understanding of how they should target different cultures. Thus, this study provided an insight into the differences between consumer groups.

A cross cultural comparison showed that functional and social values can predict luxury purchase intention, and that guilt moderates the relationship between uniqueness
value and luxury purchase intention. Individualism, in the same token, moderated the correlation between conspicuous consumption and luxury purchase intention. Attitude mediated the relationship between individual values and luxury purchase intention, but did not mediate the relationship between functional and social values as it relates to luxury purchase intention.

Despite the limitations of this study, this study indicates that it is important for luxury marketers to understand the differences between cultures. Specifically, this difference was evident among (United State) consumers with high individualism, as conspicuous consumption had more of an impact on their purchase intention versus consumers with high collectivism (Saudi Arabia).

5.3 Theoretical Implications

This research contributed to the luxury merchandising literature by highlighting two important points. First, the study identifies the differences between Western and Middle Eastern cultures by comparing US and Saudi consumers. This is the first study known to this researcher that compared those two specific cultures regarding luxury brand intentions. Most previous research studies (Bian & Forsythe, 2012; Hennigs et al., 2012; Park, Ko, & Kim, 2010; Shukla, 2011; Shukla & Purani, 2012) have compared Western culture with Eastern Asian cultures regarding luxury brand consumption. Since Saudi consumers, just as other Arabian Gulf consumers, have shown an increased demand for luxury goods in the last few years (Larenaudie, 2008), this emerging market has to be investigated and compared with other markets to improve target marketing and sales for this demographic.
This study also expands on previous research by addressing consumer guilt as a moderating variable. Although consumer guilt is highly correlated with luxury due to the high price of the products, consumer guilt has rarely been researched in the field of luxury. Consumer guilt affects their decisions either before, during, or after the decision (Lin & Xia, 2009; Özhan & Kazançoğlu, 2010). Specifically, this study assessed anticipatory guilt, and showed that consumers who have a desire for uniqueness may experience a high level of guilt. A consumer may like a luxury product but choose not to buy it to avoid feeling guilty if the product is not distinctive enough for them. This suggests that researchers in luxury marketing need to pay more attention to the impact of consumer guilt, including anticipatory, reactive, and proceeding guilt. And further studies on this variable should be done.

5.4 Managerial Implications

The findings of this study provided some strategic implications for luxury brand retailers in both the United States and Saudi markets. The top three luxury brands preferred by United States consumers were Ralph Lauren, Calvin Klein, and Michael Kors, and the top three luxury brands preferred by Saudi consumers were Chanel, Christian Dior, and Louis Vuitton. Thus, marketers of these top brands should continue their brand positioning and maintain their performance. In that same token, other luxury brands can learn from the top brands noted by consumers in this study, and assess the reasons behind higher preferences for these brands.

Although luxury brand producers should consider all luxury value dimensions, this study suggests that they need to especially emphasize the social and functional aspects of luxury products when targeting both cultures. However, it is evident given the
results of this study that social values have a greater impact among high individualism consumers, especially as it relates to conspicuous consumption. Accordingly, individualistic consumers have higher need in displaying their luxury brands logos. Thus, social image may be an important consideration in luxury marketing strategies and luxury retailers should stress the relationship between the brand name and its user’s status. The quality of the products also has to be emphasized in order to appeal to the high functional intention consumers.

Luxury retailers should enhance the uniqueness value of their products. Per the results of this study, consumer guilt moderated the relationship between uniqueness and luxury purchase intention. Therefore, if a consumer is motivated by uniqueness, producers of luxury products must make sure their products are deemed distinctive. If they are not deemed distinctive, the feeling of guilt will affect their purchase intention, which may lead to regretting and returning their purchase (Chatvijit, 2012).

Although individual values did not show a significant impact on luxury purchase intention, United States and Saudi participants showed differences that marketers should be aware of. Saudi participants scored higher in self-identity value; therefore, marketers should consider producing luxury products that align with Saudi consumers’ identity. Since most Saudis are conservative and still wear traditional Saudi clothes (Saudi Arabia Balances Liberals and Conservatives, 2014), marketers should provide luxury products that promote Saudi tastes and Saudi identity, and also relates to the conservative nature of their chosen apparel.
5.5 Limitations and Future Research

This study is subject to a few limitations. One of the main limitations is that the participants all resided in one city in Saudi Arabia and one city in the US. In order to generalize the results, participants from different cities in both countries have to be considered. Although the results may be generalized for countries with similar cultural values, such as other Arabian Gulf countries, different results may appear in different cultures. Thus, the first recommendation for future researchers is to conduct further studies to examine other Arabian Gulf countries, such as the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Qatar, which are some of the largest potential markets for luxury brands in the next few years. At present, Gulf countries are becoming an increasingly important luxury brand market as oil prices are still high and many tourists flock to Dubai (Vel et al., 2012).

The second limitation is that the focus of this study is on luxury purchase intention instead of luxury brand consumption. Although purchase intention is more effective in predicting purchase behavior than attitude, is not as effective as examining behavior itself. People can have beliefs, but these cannot necessarily predict their behavior (Solomon, 2011). For future studies, it would be more effective if the researchers examined the behavior of purchasing luxury brands.

The third limitation of this study is the gender of the participants. Most of the Saudi participants were female (97.1%). Thus, it seems that Saudi women were compared with US men and women. The fact that there were only a few males in the Saudi sample may impact the results of the study. Further studies with an equal number of males and females should be conducted.
5.6 Summary

In this chapter, a brief discussion of the major findings and hypotheses testing was provided. Then, the implications of the study were presented. Finally, the limitations and suggestions for future research were highlighted.
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APPENDIX B: SURVEY QUESTIONS

QUESTIONNAIRE DRAFT:

An Assessment of Values Concerning Luxury Brand Purchase Intention:

A Cross-Culture Comparison

Please read the following definition before you answer the questions below.

Luxury brands are brands that represent the highest level of prestigious products, and are associated with exclusivity and a high price.

Given the above definition, would you consider purchasing a luxury brand for personal usage, family usage, or for gifts to family/friends?

Yes__ No__ (Those who answer “no” will not qualify to move forward with the survey)

Which of the following brands would you consider purchasing (Check all that apply)?

- Gucci
- Chanel
- Dior
- Louis Vuitton
- Giorgio Armani
- Prada
- Burberry
- Tiffany & Co
- Cartier
- Hermes
- Ralph Lauren
- Dolce & Gabbana
- Salvatore Ferragamo
- Calvin Klein
- Fendi
- Chloe’
- Moschino
- Christian Louboutin
- Jimmy Choo
- Michael Kors
- Manolo Blahnik
- Other (please specify)_________________________
Part 1: Collectivism and Individualism

Thinking about your personal values and general way of life, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

Parents and children must stay together as much as possible

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The well-being of my coworkers is important to me

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

To me, pleasure is spending time with others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I feel good when I cooperate with others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It is important that I do my job better than others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Winning is everything

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Competition is the law of nature

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I’d rather depend on myself than others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
I often do my own thing

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Part 2 Functional Value

Thinking about your luxury purchase intention, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

Product quality superiority is my major reason for buying a luxury brand

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I place emphasis on quality assurance over prestige when considering the purchase of a luxury brand

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
A luxury brand preferred by many people that does not meet my quality standards will never enter into my purchasing considerations

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I'm often on the lookout for new products or brands that will add to my personal uniqueness

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Having an eye for products that are interesting and unusual assists me in establishing a distinctive image

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I often try to find a more interesting version of run-of-the-mill products because I enjoy being original

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
I often dress unconventionally even when it's likely to offend others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

If someone hinted that I had been dressing inappropriately for a social situation, I would continue dressing in the same manner

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I dislike brands or products that are customarily purchased by everyone

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I often try to avoid products or brands that I know are bought by the general population

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Part 3 Social value

Still thinking about your luxury purchase intention, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

**Luxury brands symbolize one’s social status**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**Luxury brands represent the latest lifestyles**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**Luxury brands signify one’s trendy image**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**Luxury brands are associated with the symbol of prestige**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Product prestige is my major reason for buying a luxury brand

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It is important for me that the luxury brand I buy improves my image

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The luxury brand I purchase must be a status symbol

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Part 4 Individual value

Still thinking about your luxury purchase intention, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

I never buy a luxury brand inconsistent with the characteristics with which I describe myself

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
The luxury brands I buy must match what and who I really am

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My choice of luxury brands depends on whether they reflect how I see myself but not how others see me

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I buy a luxury brand only because it pleases me, so I do not care about whether it pleases others

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I tend to concentrate consumption on my own pleasure rather than others', so I consider only my own pleasure

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
I can enjoy luxury brands entirely on my own terms, no matter what others may feel about them

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Based on your overall opinion of yourself, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

**On the whole, I am satisfied with myself**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**I feel that I am a person of worth**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure. (Reversed)**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
I take a positive attitude toward myself

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Part 5 Consumer Guilt

Please answer the following questions based on how you may or may not feel regarding purchasing a luxury product. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

Anticipating a future regret makes me behave more responsibly during shopping.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I do not buy expensive products in order to avoid guilt feelings

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Part 6 Attitude toward Luxury:

Thinking about your luxury purchase intention, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

I buy luxury brands because they have many benefits (e.g., quality, designer, fashion, status, etc..)

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Luxury brands satisfy my needs

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Luxury brands help to show my social status

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

In general, I am happy with luxury brands

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Part 7 Luxury Purchase Intention

Thinking about your luxury purchase intention, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statements below.

**I purchase luxury brands to show who I am**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**I would buy a luxury brand just because it has status**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**Owning luxury brands indicate a symbol of wealth**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**I would pay more for a luxury brand if it has status**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**Luxury brands are important to me because they make me feel more acceptable in my work circle**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Finally, tell us about yourself.

1. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your age?
   - 18 to 24
   - 25 to 34
   - 35 to 44
   - 45 to 54
   - 55 or older

3. What is your ethnicity?
   - American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - Asian or Pacific Islander
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - White / Caucasian
   - Arab
   - Other (please specify) ________

4. What is your approximate average household income?
   - $0-$24,999
   - $25,000-$49,999
   - $50,000-$74,999
   - $75,000-$99,999
   - $100,000-$124,999
   - $125,000-$149,999
   - $150,000-$174,999
   - $175,000-$199,999
   - $200,000 and up

Thank you
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الجزء 2: القيمة الوظيفية

معلمًا بأنه نبت نبت شعر القات، يرجى إيضاح موقفك أو عدم مواقفتك مع الإفادات أبدًا.

تقول نوعية المنتج هي السبب الأساسي في شرائي ماركة فاخرة
أكد على ضمان الجودة أكثر من المكانة عن النظر في شراء ماركة فاخرة
الشركة الفاخرة التي يفضلها أكثر من الناس والتي تأتي مع معايير خاصة بالجودة سوف لن تكون أبداً ضمن
اعتباري الخاصة بالشراء.

أما في الغالب ترقب المنتجات الجديدة والتي سوف تضيف إلى ترفيهي الشخص.

حيث يكون اهتمامي بمنتجات مثيرة وتساعدني على نحو غير عادي في ترسيخ صورة مميزة
أحاول في معظم الأوقات العثور على إصدار مثير للاهتمام من المنتجات العالية لاتنين مثابرة بالأسالفة
غالبًا ما يكون نباسي غير تقليدي حتى عندما يكون فيه مضايقة للأقرار.

إذا ما لم تجد شخص ما أن ملاهي لم تكن ملائمة في مناسبة اجتماعية، فسوف استمر في الأجواء على نفس الهيئة.
لأحب الماركات أو المنتجات التي عادة ما يشتريها معظم الناس
في الغالب أحاول تجنب الماركات أو المنتجات التي أعلم أنها قد جلبتها العامية

الجزء 2: القيمة الاجتماعية

وحيثما تزال تفكر في نيتك الخاصة بشراء فاخر، برحي إيضاحاً مواقفك أو عدم مواقفك على الإجابات التالية:

الماركات الفاخرة تدل على الحالة الاجتماعية للمرء
الماركات الفاخرة تعكس تحليل أساليب الحياة

العلامات الفاخرة تدل على الصورة الشاملة للشخص

ترتبط العلامات الفاخرة برزز الهمة والاحترام

مكانة المنتج هي السبب الرئيسي بالنسبة لي لشراء ماركة فاخرة

عنهم بالنسبة لي أن تحسن الماركة الفاخرة من صوري

ب嬉しい أن يكون شراء العلامات الفاخرة رمزًا دلا على المكانة

الجزء 3: القيمة الفردية

وأما بيزال التفكر بشأن نبئك تجاه شراء فاخر، برحي التكرر إيضاحاً مواقفك أو عدم مواقفك على الإجابات التالية:

لا أقوم أبداً بشراء ماركة فاخرة لا تتوافق مع الخصائص التي أصفها بنفسي

ببج أن تتماشى الماركات الفاخرة التي أقوم بشراءها مع ما ومن أنا في الواقع

اختياري للماركات الفاخرة يقوم على ما إذا كنت ترضي كيف أنظر إلى نفسي وليس كيف يراى الآخرون

أقوم بشراء الماركات الفاخرة لأنها ترضيني، إذاً ليس مهماً إذا كنت لا ترضي الآخرين.

إميل إلى تركيز الاستهلاك على ما يرضيي شخصاً وليس الآخرين، إذاً أفكر في متعتى فقط

يمكننا الاستمتاع بماركات فاخرة تماماً وفقاً لمصطلحاتي الخاصة، حيث لا يهمي إحساس الآخرين تجاهها.
بناءً على رأي العامل، يرجى إيضاح موافقتك أو عدم موافتك على الإفادات التالية:

- عموماً إنني راض عن نفس اشترى شخص ذي قيمة وجمالاً، أميل إلى الاعتقاد أن نفي فاشل. (معكس)
- تأخذ موقفاً إيجابياً تجاه نفس

الجزء 1 شعور المستهلك بالذنب

يرجى التكرم الإجابة على جميع الأسئلة التالية بناء على كيف يمكن أن إن تشعر أو لا تشعر نية شراء ماركة فاخرة. يرجى إيضاح موافقتك أو عدم موافقتك على الإفادات التالية.

إن توقع الندم في المستقبل يجعله من الصعب مستندية أكثر أثناء التسوق.
لا تعبر منتجات باهظة الثمن من تجنب الشعور بالذنب

الجزء 2 الموقع نجاح الرفاهية

حيث تفكر بشأن نتمك نية شراء فاخر، يرجى التكرم إيضاح موافقتك أو عدم موافقتك على الإفادات التالية.

أقوم بشراء ماركات فاخرة لأن فيها عدة مزايا (مثل الجودة، التصميم، الطراز، المكانة، الخ)
الماركات الفاخرة تشغيل حاجتي الماركات الفاخرة تساعدني في ظهور مكانتي الاجتماعية
عموماً، أنا مصور بماركات الفاخرة

الجزء 3 نية شراء الأشياء الفاخرة

حيث تفكر بشأن نتمك نية شراء فاخر، يرجى التكرم إيضاح موافقتك أو عدم موافقتك على الإفادات التالية.

أقوم بشراء ماركات فاخرة لإظهار أن أنا أفضل شراء الماركات الفاخرة فقط لأن لها مكانة
امتلاك ماركة فاخرة بين لزم الثروة.
سوف أدفع أكثر للاحتفال إذا كانت لها مكانة ووضع
العلامات الفاخرة مهمة بالنسبة لي لأنها تجعلني أشعر بقبول أكثر في دائرة عمل
في الختم، حديثًا عن نفسك.
1. ما هو نوعك؟
2. كم عمرك؟
3. ما هو عرقك؟
• هندي أمريكا أو من مواطني أستراليا
• أسود أم من جزيرة في الباسيفيك
• أسود أم أمريكي أفريقى
• من أصل أسترالي أو لاذين
• أبيض/أبيض من القوقاز
• عربي
• أخر (خريج التنيد)

4. ما هو متوسط المرتب التقريبي لأهل بيتك؟
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